PROCEEDINGS OF THE
NEW JERSEY
HISTORICAL SOCIETY
VOLUME LXXV, NUMBER 4, OCTOBER 1957
WHOLE NUMBER 291

The Historical Society Is an Educational Institution

RICHARD P. McCORMICK

THAT the historical society is an educational institution is a proposition with which I find myself in entire agreement. I would go further and insist that the proposition could hardly be the occasion for controversy. If, then, we wish to find areas about which we can disagree, at least for the purposes of evoking discussion and stimulating thought, we shall have to look through this proposition to discover some of the submerged issues that lie beneath its bland surface.

The first issue is one of definition. What, precisely, is the educational role of the historical society? The answer, in brief, might be that the role is a dual one. The societies have a scholarly role, which commits them to advance the frontiers of historical knowledge. They have a popular role, which leads them into the field that I shall call "informal education." If we utilize the approach of our favorite discipline, we can observe the development of these roles within an historical context.

Our earliest historical societies conceived of themselves

THE AUTHOR is a well-known New Jersey historian, member of the Rutgers University faculty, and president of the New Jersey Historical Society. Printed on these pages is the text of his speech delivered at the annual meeting of the American Association for State and Local History on October 4, 1957, at Columbus, Ohio. Friends and members of the New Jersey Historical Society will find Dr. McCormick's words both interesting and stimulating.

primarily as scholarly institutions. Founded by men who were apt to be of the aristocratic tradition of learning and who were often themselves talented amateur historians, they were the products of an age that knew neither democratic education nor public subsidy. Their major functions were to collect and preserve documents and relics, publish collections of source materials, and facilitate the writing of history in the scholarly tradition. That they were not completely oblivious to wider educational responsibilities is evidenced by the fact that they sponsored occasional public lectures, engaged in the promotion of anniversary celebrations, and—at least in one instance—used the newspaper as a medium for disseminating historical information. But their direct influence tended to be restricted to their own membership and the scholarly investigators who secured access to their collections. With the passage of time they became dignified, exclusive, even snobbish, and as their private endowments grew, they felt under no real pressure to serve a wide public audience.

The services to scholarship of the societies that grew from this tradition have been immense. Their great libraries, their volumes of printed source collections, and their published papers and monographs have placed virtually every American historian in their debt. Moreover, by a kind of "trickle down" process their influence does reach indirectly every ultimate consumer of history.

It is generally recognized that a new impulse entered the field with the incorporation of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin in 1854. As the recipient of annual appropriations from the state, this society—and others that were soon established on a similar basis—recognized an obligation to pursue an aggressive educational policy. Reuben G. Thwaites, an illustrious director of the Wisconsin society, expressed the philosophy of the state-supported society in this way in 1897:

> Such a society, in order to continue in the receipt of substantial government aid, must be popular in its organization and methods; it must perpetually demonstrate its reason for being, by proving useful and inspiring to the public whose support it seeks . . . In short, a State-

supported historical society should recognize that a necessary condition of its existence is the cultivation of a sound historical interest among the people at large . . .

Initially, if we are to accept the further testimony of Thwaites, the fact of state aid inspired activities that were "designed chiefly as popular attractions." But in time he and his colleagues came to have a genuine appreciation of the potential educational values that could be built into their program. This distinction between a "popular attraction" and a sound educational effort is crucial. Obviously, the implications of this distinction must be understood if the historical society is to merit the designation of an educational institution.

Originating, then, in rather a calculated attempt to win popular support in return for state subsidy, the function of "informal education" has become an increasingly important one in our historical societies. The general democratization of our culture, the emergence of enlightened concepts of social responsibility, and the necessity for seeking ever broader bases of financial support, have induced all but a minority of historical societies to engage in programs of "informal education."

Although these two educational roles—the scholarly and the informal—are quite different, they are not incompatible. Properly viewed, they are complementary. And when they are kept in reasonable balance each contributes to the strengthening of the other. At the same time, we must recognize that this differentiation of educational function can breed serious problems.

It is not easy to attempt to measure the success with which our historical societies today are attaining their dual educational objectives. But some such assessment would seem to be appropriate. In the interest of brevity—and also for purposes of evoking discussion, I shall assume we are all aware of the solid achievements that stand to the credit of the societies and call attention instead to some deficiencies and dangers.

In viewing our scholarly function we can take stock of several concerns. The hard fact that the scholarly activities of a society do not apparently commend themselves to popular sources of financial support may produce a kind of atrophy of this function.

When our collections become static, our library staff dwindles, and our scholarly publications cease, we are in trouble. When our libraries resign themselves to providing free reference services for genealogists, we are in a bad way, indeed. If we are to do more than pay lip service to our scholarly mission, the direction of our societies must be in the hands of men who are themselves scholars. Scholarship is the conscience of any historical enterprise. Without it we shall not be able to distinguish a "popular attraction" from the genuine educational endeavor.

Turning to the area of informal education, we can well be impressed with the tremendous advances made in recent decades. Our societies have both stimulated and catered to the growing curiosity of our people about their past. Using all kinds of media —museums, restorations, magazines, pamphlets, lectures, traveling exhibits, newspapers, tape recorders, radio, television, and movies—they have conscientiously sought to reach every possible constituency.

This educational effort is hard to characterize. It is not systematic. It has no curriculum. It requires little participation or effort on the part of the client. It is directed at every age group from the school child to the octogenarian. Its educational objectives have not been clearly defined nor has its impact been measured. It is, I think, best described as "informal education."

What distinguishes this "informal education" from mere show is intelligent interpretation rooted in scholarly understanding. If we are anxious to do more than gratify idle curiosity or purvey entertainment, we must so appeal to the interest and intelligence of our audience as to illuminate their historical understanding.

We may at times be guilty of substituting for true education pointless historical anecdotes, chauvinistic appeals to local pride, spectacular displays of relics and artifacts, or condescendingly simplified versions of historical developments. These are besetting sins of "informal education" just as pedantry and exclusivism are the worst features on the scholarly side. They represent taking the easy way out in securing crowd appeal. They also represent what can happen when history loses its scholarly conscience.

There is a critical need to philosophize about the nature of this "informal education" in which historical societies engage. To say merely that we are "bringing history to the people" is not enough. We need to define our objectives, clarify our goals, evaluate our methods, fix our boundaries. We might well make some effort to evaluate the effectiveness of our programs in terms of their educational impact. I am not at all sure that either attendance figures or mounting appropriations provide such a measuring stick.

There is a final aspect of this proposition that deserves serious consideration. Originally the two educational functions that I have been describing belonged almost exclusively to the historical society's special preserve. I am not sure that we understand yet the implications of this development.

On the scholarly side, for example, we have witnessed the emergence of organizations of professional historians and the publication of several professional journals devoted to American history. American history—local, state, and regional—is being written today by men whose base is the university rather than the historical society. University libraries are building significant historical collections, and university presses are publishing more books about state and local history than are the historical societies. Possessed of resources of money and manpower that few historical societies can match, the universities are challenging the societies in the area of historical scholarship.

In the field of informal education a similar condition is apparent. History is now being "brought to the people" under the auspices of the National Park Service, scores of more or less well-endowed restorations, state historic sites agencies and bureaus of archives and history, diversified municipal museums, *Life* magazine, and—with startling success—*American Heritage*. Virtually every type of activity in which an historical society engages is now duplicated by some other kind of agency.

You are facing stiff competition. Can your quarterly magazine compete in scholarly appeal with the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* or in popular appeal with *American Heritage?* Can your library holdings match those of Harvard or Illinois or your

proudly restored local landmarks equal the high but expensive quality standards set by Williamsburg or Winterthur? Will your constituents and members be satisfied with second or third rate performances after they have come to appreciate the best?

If the historical societies, having lost their monopolistic position, are going to survive and compete successfully as educational institutions they can best do so by offering a quality product. Instead of undertaking a vast array of activities, and perhaps carrying them out in an indifferent manner, they may have to concentrate their resources on carefully selected projects that will produce the greatest educational values. As pioneers in the field, they may be expected to develop new means of achieving their purposes, thus regaining in some measure their claim to an exclusive function.

In the future, even more than in the past, the historical societies will have to recruit trained talent of exceptional capabilities if they are to hold their own in the face of the kind of competition I have described. They must be managed by men and women of sound scholarly instincts, imbued with a devotion to history and a zeal to communicate its values. Our societies need educators, in the finest meaning of that somewhat abused term. Upon our success in recruiting such personnel may well depend the future soundness of our societies as educational institutions. Improperly guided, the societies may become either little used warehouses of historical data or sponsors of popular attractions.

I would hope that this cursory view of the nature of the educational functions of historical societies and of some of the problems involved in carrying out those functions now and in the future will not leave a negative impression with you. It is only because our societies have reached such a high level of achievement that we can indulge ourselves in the mature experience of self-criticism and analysis. Our progress in the past thirty years has been so remarkable as to constitute a new era. With equally talented leadership in the years ahead, we can expect to adapt to the challenges that confront us and enhance our educational effectiveness.

A New Jersey Gadfly

WALLACE EVAN DAVIES

THE name of William O. McDowell is almost unknown today, but in the closing years of the nineteenth century and in the opening years of the twentieth century he was quite conspicuous in a wide variety of movements. Perhaps his greatest claim to any permanent fame lies in his part in founding the Sons of the American Revolution and the Daughters of the American Revolution, but in addition he was active in so many other matters, many of them of an extremely curious and controversial nature for a founder of the S.A.R. and D.A.R., that it seems appropriate to label him "A New Jersey Gadfly." McDowell was not necessarily a typical product of New Jersey, but it is interesting that the state did produce such an unusual person.

Very often it is extremely difficult to trace the careers of individuals like this who may attract much attention in their own time but who then quickly vanish from public memory after their deaths. Such might have happened to William O. McDowell, had he not been careful to take the steps that are essential for winning one type of immortality—mention in the writings of historians. What McDowell did to preserve himself against ultimate obscurity was to express himself voluminously in writing, and then to preserve a copy of everything he wrote in a series of old-fashioned letterbooks. He also kept all the letters he received. Finally, he had an eagle eye, abetted either by a widespread collection of devoted friends or by an efficient clipping service, or both, for everything about himself that ever appeared in print. In consequence, eventually he was able to fill up some seventy volumes of scrapbooks, all devoted to the career of William O. McDowell. To insure his not being overlooked, he presented all this material to the New York Public Library. This essay therefore is McDowell's reward for doing what his-

THE AUTHOR, a member of the history department, University of Pennsylvania, is currently with the Department of American Studies, University of Manchester (England). This paper was among those presented at the recent New Jersey Historical Conference in New Brunswick.

torians wish every person of any prominence would do, that is, preserve their papers.[1]

William Osborne McDowell was born on April 10, 1848, on a farm at Pluckemin, in Bedminster Township, Somerset County, New Jersey. The property, known as "The Retreat," had been in the McDowell family ever since the arrival of the original immigrant, Ephraim McDowell, in New Jersey in 1730. McDowell's immediate forebears were all well-educated men. Both grandfathers were Presbyterian ministers, one having attended Princeton and been moderator of the entire Presbyterian Church in the United States at one time, while the other, we are told, was a gentleman who committed the entire New Testament to memory. Furthermore, McDowell's father was a physician of considerable local prominence. But McDowell himself, curiously, had no formal education beyond the public schools of Somerset County. He later indicated that the Civil War had interrupted his schooling and forced him to go to work, without explaining why this was the case, and added that he had subsequently taken courses in commercial colleges and "by observation and reading, helped to educate himself."[2]

Apparently he first worked in a leather factory on Market Street, Newark, then in a machine factory and later as a life insurance clerk. These being the Civil War years, he also worked in an army supply station until, he claimed, he received an appointment in 1864 as a lieutenant in the volunteers to which his father refused his consent because the lad was still under age. He then became the local secretary for the Christian Commission, is said to have helped collect over $10,000 for it in ten days and then to have served at its headquarters in the field. His health having broken down, he returned home to recuperate,

[1]Obviously, nearly all the information in this article is drawn from the William O. McDowell scrapbooks and letterbooks in the New York Public Library. The fullest accounts of his career, apparently written by McDowell himself and hence not completely reliable, are in the *National Cyclopaedia of American Biography,* III (New York, 1893), 147-48 and John James Scannell, ed., *Scannell: New Jersey's First Citizens and State Guide,* III (Paterson, N.J., 1923), 264-66. For fairly full obituaries, see *New York Times,* March 13, 1927, and especially *The World* (New York), March 13, 1927. Frequent reference to McDowell's many activities may be found in Wallace Evan Davies, *Patriotism on Parade* (Cambridge, Mass., 1955).

[2]Scannel, *op. cit.,* p. 265.

and after a little while went to work for Matthew Brady, the famous Civil War photographer. "This service resulted in a second breakdown,"[3] he later commented, somewhat cryptically. After this experience, he was employed as a clerk in the selling department of a wholesale grocery firm in New York City, but quickly rose to become a partner in a cordage and twine manufacturing firm on Chambers Street in the same city. Subsequently he seems to have also been an officer of a firm of bankers and brokers dealing in railroad and mining securities, proprietor of a journal which supplied information concerning such securities and, finally, partner of a firm in Arlington, New Jersey, which made various types of engines and mining and milling machinery.

But apparently his greatest business success came in the field of re-organizing several railroads, beginning in the middle 1870's, which he said won him fees as high as a quarter of a million dollars. In the 1880's he even became a railroad president for a while, heading the New York and Sea Beach Railroad, which, again according to his own statement, had been losing $60,000 a year but under his management was soon showing a $30,000 annual profit. Within a very few years, however, a majority of the stockholders were demanding his resignation, which stockholders do not ordinarily do to a president who has just triumphantly turned a substantial deficit into a handsome surplus. As a result, McDowell was soon involved in a protracted and complicated legal conflict of just the sort that was so often to be the outcome of his participation in an enterprise. This was merely an early demonstration of how his peculiar combination of enthusiastic impracticality, a strong desire always to be in the limelight and a great talent for public controversy had produced a highly developed knack for quickly antagonizing many of the people with whom he worked. Thus by the time McDowell was thirty the distinguished New York industrialist and political leader, Abram Hewitt, was already denouncing him in the newspapers as "a common scold and a common libeller," as well as

[3] *Ibid.*

"a blackmailer and a common liar."[4] Obviously we are dealing with a fairly complicated but rather fascinating individual who, whatever else he may have been, was never dull.

And obviously he had his fingers in a great many other things, for what has been described so far, though the essential background for his other activities, would never be worth any attention from a later generation. What distinguished McDowell, however, was the way that the same restless, inquiring mind and the same enthusiasm and energy which caused both success and difficulties in his business life also led him into an amazing variety of public activities, and with the same consequences. As early as 1879 the *Newark Daily Journal* observed that he "is obviously happiest when running a public meeting."[5] There can be no question that he embraced all these causes with genuine ardor, but one also wonders if this intense, dark-haired man who sported a luxuriant moustache and beard may well have found considerable psychological compensation for his frequently mentioned shortness of height in the prominent role he played in all these activities.

Quite commendably, McDowell's attention turned first to improving educational facilities in his home state. According to his own account, he worked for the passage of a free public library law in New Jersey and then, by distributing copies of it at his own expense, helped establish such institutions in cities like Newark, Jersey City, Bayonne and Hackensack. He also agitated for the introduction of libraries into public schools and took the credit for a New Jersey law of 1884 which provided for the first public technical schools, and took the credit for a New Jersey law of 1884 which provided for the first public technical schools, then raising money to start the first one in Newark in 1886. Just how important his part in all this actually was is hard to tell, for McDowell was always inclined to argue that the success of any movement which he had favored was therefore due to his efforts.

Some of McDowell's crusades, it might be noticed, were not

[4]*Newark Daily Advertiser,* Oct. 31, 1878; *New York Daily Tribune,* Oct. 31, 1878; *New York World,* Oct. 31, 1878.

[5]*Newark Daily Journal,* April 11, 1879.

unrelated to his business interests. His railroad activities had led him quite naturally into various real estate speculations in the areas served by these lines. Thus, when he agitated for cheaper transit from New York City to New Jersey, he realized that this would greatly stimulate the development of the region where he had many investments. Similarly, he was long interested in an organization known as the American Institute of Christian Philosophy, which was founded by a well-known New York minister, the Rev. Charles F. Deems ,and which for several years conducted a summer school modelled on the Chautauqua movement and the Concord School of Philosophy in Massachusetts. McDowell served as its treasurer and claimed that he gave it twelve-thousand dollars, as well as erecting a hall of philosophy for it at Warwick Woodlands on Greenwood Lake, on the New Jersey-New York border, but it also so happened that one of the railroads with which he was connected was the one serving that area. He also had extensive real estate holdings there whose resort possibilities he was anxious to publicize by having the religious organization meet there. Again, in the late 1880's he deserved credit for his outspoken opposition to the Chinese Exclusion Act, but his his undoubtedly sincere pro-Chinese feelings were also very much mixed up with his persistent, though fruitless, efforts to promote a syndicate for the economic development of China. This proved to be an overly ambitious project that involved him in close association with a gentleman named Yung Wing, who at one time had been Chinese minister to the United States but who had since withdrawn to the presumably Oriental calm of Hartford, Connecticut.

If it seems unduly cynical to notice this interplay of idealism and economic interest in McDowell's activities, in all fairness it should be pointed out at once that this hardly seems to be true in the case of his pro-labor sympathies, which nowadays seem curiously incongruous for anyone who was to be so closely identified with the S.A.R. and D.A.R. Despite all his attempted forays into the world of high finance and capitalistic enterprise, McDowell apparently never lost a sense of identification with the working class acquired during a youthful apprenticeship to a

trade. He joined the Knights of Labor, the prominent labor organization of the 1880's, rising to the rank of "venerable Sage" in it, and became well-acquainted with its head, Terence V. Powderly. He was also active in labor politics in Newark and in 1886 heartily supported Henry George's candidacy for mayor of New York City on a radical third party ticket. In the great railroad strike of 1886 against the Jay Gould lines he took so prominent a part in its settlement as a representative of the workers that he was later called to testify before a Congressional committee that was investigating labor disturbances. The resultant publicity led to talk of his being appointed one of the original members of the Interstate Commerce Commission or being named a labor candidate for Congress.

Much concerned about the capital-labor conflict which was alarming so many thoughtful middle class liberals in the late nineteenth century, he spent a good deal of time publicizing his solution, which was the establishment of co-operative enterprises, advising workers on railroads and in factories to buy up the stock of their companies so that they could then run them themselves. At the time of the Pullman Strike of 1894, which soon led into a great national railroad strike, the president of the Universal Peace Union suggested that President Cleveland make McDowell a member of a committee to investigate the causes of the crisis. While McDowell clearly was never an actual radical, today his sympathies might make him quite unpopular with the two famous patriotic organizations which he helped to found.

This brings us to the subject of organized patriotism, to which McDowell increasingly devoted so much of his energy. When he first left home as a young boy, he recalled years later, he "determined to give part of each day to 'altruistic' work on patriotic lines, and I think I can conscientiously say that since that time there has not a day passed over my head without some part of it being given to the fulfillment of the self-pledge that I had made."[6] Eventually he applied this dictum to everyone else, stating, "I believe it to be every citizen's duty to give part of each day to patriotic work."[7] In stating such views, McDowell

[6]McDowell to Luther Tarbell, Dec. 19, 1889, McDowell Letterbooks.
[7]McDowell to W. Seward Webb, Nov. 21, 1889, *ibid.*

was merely expressing the heightened sense of nationalism which was becoming so prevalent at the close of the nineteenth century. Perhaps his New Jersey background contributed to this feeling, for it could certainly be argued that the Middle Atlantic States have always had less sectional feeling and in a sense have been more typically American than other regions of the United States.

The most conspicuous demonstration of this nationalistic feeling was the rise of innumerable patriotic societies in this country during the 1880's and 1890's. It was in those years that nearly all the well-know hereditary organizations like, for example, the S.A.R., D.A.R., Colonial Dames, and Society of Mayflower Descendants, were founded, and McDowell participated fully in these developments. Regardless of the more complicated underlying reasons for their appearance, which ranged from fear of the New Immigration to a desire to heal the sectional breach caused by the Civil War, the immediate occasion for their formation was the centennial observances of the events of the American Revolution.[8] Thus the one-hundredth anniversary of the British evacuation of New York City in 1783 led in 1883 to the founding of a group known as the Sons of the Revolution, composed of the descendants of men who had served in the war.

McDowell, who was very much aware that he descended from several Revolutionary soldiers and was extremely proud of it, had followed with great interest accounts of centennial celebrations both in Newburgh, New York, and in New York City in 1883. When a few months later he learned of the newly-formed Sons of the Revolution, he was therefore quick to become a member. Once in it, he proceeded to liven it up in a fashion that soon disconcerted its more sedate members. Learning that the American committee which was raising money for the completion of the pedestal of the Statue of Liberty was about to suspend construction because of its lack of financial success, McDowell became a member of a committee of the Sons to help provide funds. This was scarely a challenge to a man who a few years earlier had allegedly raised fifty-thousand dollars in two days for victims of the Chicago fire, not to mention the ten-thousand dollars for Civil War relief work when he was only

[8]For a full discussion of this subject, see Davies, *op. cit.*, pp. 44-73.

sixteen. McDowell's instinctive flair for publicity went into immediate action. He devised the idea of a mass campaign for one dollar subscriptions, inducing President Chester A. Arthur and a number of other prominent public officials to head the list. He also had a procession, headed by the fife and drums corps of a local G.A.R. post, march from the Battery through the downtown financial district as far as Union Square; en route it collected six hundred dollars. Finally, he persuaded every steamboat in New York Harbor to whistle as it passed Bedloe's Island, as a reminder of the unfinished pedestal.

The original American Committee, headed by a staid former Secretary of State, William M. Evarts, was for some reason irritated when McDowell rather brashly wrote Evarts that, unless there was some action on its part, McDowell's group would take over the entire project. Finally the two committees had a conference, as a result of which the Sons of the Revolution relinquished its claims, but at least the New York *World* then took up the idea of a popular subscription drive and the pedestal was finished.

But it had not been the purpose of the average conservative members of the Sons of the Revolution to envelop the society in the notoriety resulting from the lavish use of steam whistles and brass bands or to engage in public disputes with a distinguished former Secretary of State. Hence the Sons of the Revolution showed a conspicuous lack of enthusiasm for McDowell's next proposal, that in 1889 the Sons should sponsor an elaborate observance of the approaching anniversary of George Washington's inauguration in New York in 1789. McDowell was indignant that the Sons seemed to be satisfied with a military parade and ball. He thought that something should be done to give the celebration a permanent world-wide influence and that, at the very least, there ought to be a New York World's Fair opening on April 30, 1889, a project which eventually did materialize, except that it was exactly fifty years later. McDowell finally concluded that the only solution was to organize a branch of the Sons of the Revolution in New Jersey that would be more responsive to his schemes.

This he did in March, 1889, but the original society of Sons in New York refused to give it any recognition. By this time McDowell's pushing manner, flamboyant schemes and general instability had so irritated the genteel and rather stuffy leaders of the Sons of the Revolution that they were soon denouncing him as a person whose "combination of pertinacity, vanity and effrontery is unparalleled, and whose insensibility to the usages of polite life is manifest in every movement."[9]

McDowell was not one to be rebuffed by mere words, and instead he turned with vigor to organizing similar societies in other states throughout the country. With his usual ingenuity, he appealed in the press for Revolutionary descendants to correspond with him and asked all the state governors to summon meetings in their respective capitols to organize groups. While some official replies were as evasive as one would expect, an amazing number co-operated, so that by the end of April, 1889, societies were in existence in several states. Then, at McDowell's instigation, representatives of these different societies met at Fraunces Tavern in New York following the centennial celebration on April 30, 1889, and formed the present-day National Society Sons of the American Revolution.

This was only the beginning of McDowell's efforts, for he wanted the S.A.R. to have branches in every state in the country. Absolutely tireless in his ability to write an incredible number of letters and entirely unabashed about approaching any person of the slightest fame whether he had any acquaintance with him or not, McDowell interested large numbers of people, many of them quite distinguished, in his project, and the fact that so many complete strangers of prominence responded so cordially showed that McDowell had indeed struck one of the most popular chords of the coming decade of the 1890's, that of nationalism and patriotism. He then followed up this correspondence with a series of personal appearances throughout the country. "It is like receiving a lesson in American patriotism to talk with William O.

[9] *An Explanation of Some of the Differences Between the Society of Sons of the Revolution and the Society of Sons of the American Revolution* (Philadelphia, 1890), p. 6.

McDowell," a Chicago newspaper wrote concerning his appearance there. "He has more of the Spirit of '76 in him than could be found in a city of ordinary business men."[10] It was little wonder that, after a whirl through the Southern states, the president-general of the S.A.R. wrote admiringly to him, "Your forte is organization. I only wish there was enough money in the treasury to keep you at that work the next two years."[11] McDowell was so successful that the Sons of the American Revolution soon far outstripped the parent Sons of the Revolution, which, however, took refuge in rather sniffy comments that it preferred quality to quantity.

Several of these new state societies of the Sons of the American Revolution originally included women among their members, but, in a futile effort for a rapprochement with the more conservative Sons of the Revolution, the S.A.R. soon limited eligibility to males. McDowell thereupon began agitating for the formation of a Daughters of the American Revolution, but at first with no particular success. Then in July, 1890, he spotted a letter in the *Washington Post* written by a Mrs. Mary S. Lockwood. Mrs. Lockwood, a somewhat feminist-minded lady, had reacted indignantly to the S.A.R.'s change of attitude toward female members, and in this letter she called attention to the part women also had played in the American Revolution, citing particularly the case of a New Jersey heroine of the conflict, one Hannah Arnett. McDowell's reaction was especially vigorous because, by a coincidence which hardly seems believable but is absolutely true, it just so happened that he was the great-great-grandson of Hannah Arnett. This, of course, was all the encouragement he needed. He promptly wrote the *Post*, asking all women of Revolutionary descent to send him their names as the first step toward starting a D.A.R. He also circularized copies of Mrs. Lockwood's article among persons like Mrs. William H. Vanderbilt who he thought might be likely prospects for financing such a move. It was McDowell who finally presided at the meeting in Washington on October 11, 1890, which is usually considered to mark the official formation of the present Daughters of the American

[10] *Chicago Tribune*, Jan. 5, 1890.

[11] Lucius P. Deming to McDowell, May 17, 1889, McDowell Scrapbooks, VII.

Revolution, which in size and influence has long since far surpassed both the Sons of the Revolution and the Sons of the American Revolution. Once having helped to start the new organization, however, McDowell did not long have an important voice in its later history, for the strong-minded females who were the original members of the D.A.R. were not going to follow the lead of any man for very long.

But this hardly left McDowell unoccupied, because he was much concerned about the proper function of the Sons of the American Revolution. Like many subsequent critics of such organizations, McDowell feared it would become too social or too antiquarian. "Two paths open to our Society," he announced in an address to all the members of the S.A.R. in June, 1889. "It may collect and treasure relics, trace ancestors, and extol the heroic era of our nation. It may cultivate knee buckles, cocked hats and swords, wigs, scarlet vests and stockings, and all those ancient costumes once so picturesque, so brilliant and so suitable." This program, which is a farily accurate description of exactly what these groups have done ever since, then, he felt would appeal to those who "look behind rather than before for the golden age of our humanity."

But McDowell felt that the Sons "have a nobler mission than devotion to the antique and aesthetical." This was to stand for the principle of republicanism, not merely in the United States, but everywhere. As he put it, "Our hearts should embrace self-government throughout the world."[12] His first step was to appeal to the presidents of all republics, wherever found, to sponsor similar organizations of descendants of the men who had achieved independence in their respective countries, but this effort for an international Sons of the Revolution was not very productive. McDowell wanted more than just closer relations with existing republics. He wanted the Sons to "reach out our hands to the men throughout the world, not only to those who have secured self-government, but to those who are still 'hoping against fate.' "[13] He had hopes that the first national convention

[12]"Address to the Society of Sons of the American Revolution," McDowell Scrapbooks, XXVIII.

[13]McDowell to Luther Tarbell, June 13, 1889, McDowell Scrapbooks, XLI.

of the S.A.R. in Louisville in the spring of 1890 would support his efforts to foment world-wide revolution.

In this he was greatly mistaken. He was thinking in terms of an idealistic internationalism quite at variance with the dominant nationalism of the day, which was what made an organization like the S.A.R. so appealing to its members, and he suffered the same fate as he had earlier in the Sons of the Revolution. The S.A.R. now fell under the control of conservative individuals like Chauncey Depew of the New York Central Railroad and General Horace Porter, later to be President McKinley's ambassador to France, who had very little sympathy with this erstwhile supporter of T.V. Powderly and Henry George who seemed to envelop in notoriety every project he touched. After the Louisville meeting McDowell had little influence in the S.A.R., and by the end of the 1890's he was known as the man "who appears to cause discord wherever mentioned in the Sons of the American Revolution."[14]

But such rebuffs could not halt William O. McDowell; he merely moved on to new schemes. As one interviewer commented to him about this time, "you talk to a person for fifteen minutes, and he is surprised to find himself organized in some patriotic affair."[15] Announcing that "there is a natural conflict between the two forms of government that now rule the world, the one based on the theory of the Divine right of kings and aristocracy, the other based on the beliefs of the Divine rights of the people as expressed in the Declaration of Independence,"[16] later in 1890 he formed the Order of the American Eagle to carry out the principles he had been advocating. It was to admit only those who had done something to extend the American principles of political freedom. Among those found worthy in the next few months were James G. Blaine, the aged Louis Kossuth, Andrew Carnegie, a descendant of Lafayette, the president of Brazil, and McDowell's long-time Chinese friend, Yung Wing.

Since the Order of the American Eagle existed only on paper

[14]*Spirit of '76*, IV (Aug., 1898), p. 358.

[15]"Kate Field's Washington," Jan. 21, 1891, in McDowell Scrapbooks, XLI.

[16]Minutes of the Order of the American Eagle, William O. McDowell Papers, New York Public Library.

and never actually did anything, McDowell turned to another project for promoting world-wide freedom. This was his idea of a Pan Republic Congress, which would be an international gathering of delegates of the world's republics and would sponsor various forms of co-operation among them, such as uniform weights and measures, common customs regulations and peaceful methods for settling disputes. McDowell, whom a California newspaper now described as "an amiable gentleman with a fondness for punching off very wearisome letters on a typewriter,"[17] bombarded numerous prominent individuals with appeals for support. In addition to the many leaders of patriotic societies who expressed enthusiasm for the idea, he won approval, as well as often contributions, from such diverse figures as President Grover Cleveland, ex-President Rutherford B. Hayes, Andrew Carnegie, Frances Willard of the W.C.T.U., and William C. Whitney, grandfather of the present American ambassador to Great Britain. Religious support ranged from the Roman Catholic Cardinal Gibbons through the liberal Protestant clergyman, Lyman Abbott, to the agnostic Robert Ingersoll. Only an occasional individual apparently dared express a qualm concerning so meritorious a scheme. One of these few was the distinguished leader of the Social Gospel, the Rev. Washington Gladden of Columbus, Ohio. "Your project is so vast that it confounds me," he replied to McDowell. "I haven't a word to say. The weather is too hot."[18]

When a meeting was finally held in New York City, attended by President Andrews of Brown University, the Rev. Charles F. Deems, McDowell's associate in the American Institute of Christian Philosophy, and, again, Yung Wing, among others, the *New York Times* rather unkindly titled its account of the gathering, "Members of the Big Committee Meet, But Accomplish Little."[19] The group in turn formed another organization, the Human Freedom League, which was to sponsor Pan Republic Congresses every five years in various cities of the leading republics of the world, but it soon faded out of existence as McDowell once more

[17] *Alta California* (San Francisco), Oct. 6, 1890.
[18] Washington Gladden to McDowell, June 30, 1890, McDowell Scrapbooks, XXXIII.
[19] *New York Times*, Dec. 7, 1890.

progressed to other issues. Even so, the support this particular movement gained showed how strong an appeal the ideal of republicanism had for many Americans of that time.

Retreating for the moment from his efforts to spread republicanism over the entire world, McDowell now turned to encouraging patriotic sentiment within the United States. He shared the feeling of so many leaders of American patriotic societies that an emphasis upon certain rituals and symbols would somehow increase the amount of patriotism within the country. These were the years that gave rise to a veritable cult of the American flag, which took such forms as insisting that the flag fly over every school house, that the students engage in daily flag salutes, that Flag Day should be a legal holiday, and that any desecration of the flag should be sharply punished.[20] McDowell's contribution to this particular phase of patriotic fetishism was to agitate in the early 1890's for the erection of a large "Liberty Flagpole" on the New Jersey Highlands so that it would be the first thing seen by an ocean vessel approaching New York Harbor. He rallied many leaders of different patriotic orders to the cause, and Mrs. Russell Sage decided that she would use the movement to train both her niece and the young daughter of Jay Gould, the future Mrs. Helen Gould Shepard, "in the lines of Christian philanthropy and patriotism."[21] The flag was finally raised in April, 1893, but McDowell failed to induce S.A.R. leaders to finance the erection of similar flagpoles in other countries.

McDowell's next enterprise, more bizarre than anything else he had yet attempted, involved another famous patriotic symbol, the Liberty Bell. Toward the end of 1892 he conceived the idea of making a replica of it, to be known as the Columbian Liberty Bell, which would first be shown at the forthcoming Chicago World's Fair and then would travel all over the country proclaiming liberty and peace. With the help of his chief supporter in the D.A.R., Miss Mary Desha, he appealed to the membership of all the patriotic societies not only for cash contributions but also for Revolutionary relics to be used in making the replica. In

[20]See Davies, *op. cit.*, pp. 218-22.

[21]Mrs. Russell Sage to McDowell, Oct. 24, 1892, McDowell Scrapbooks, LXI.

return for the backing of the Daughters of the American Revolution, McDowell proposed that on the society's third anniversary in October, 1893, the bell be struck three times, and then once for every chapter organized up to that time; by counting the number of strokes, each member would be able to recognize the one for her particular chapter, and thus know for whom the bell tolled. The first note was to be struck by the president-general of the D.A.R., who then happened to be Mrs. Adlai E. Stevenson, grandmother of the presidential candidate of recent years.

The appeal for relics proved astonishingly successful. From Hawaii the wife of the recently established republic sent some metal. Mrs. Stevenson and her two sisters donated silver spoons. Other contributions included the silver shoe buckle of a participant in the Boston Tea Party, a knob from a clock that had once belonged to Thomas Jefferson, and some silver eyeglass frames which had been made from a spoon which had been cast at the same time that bullets were being made for the Battle of Bennington. It was no wonder that by the middle of May, 1893, the press was reporting that the top floor of McDowell's house in Newark "is assuming the appearance of an old curiosity shop."[22] This procedure aroused some criticism. If these mementoes had any real value, complained the *New York Sun,* should they not be sent to some museum instead of being destroyed? "We wonder," it added somewhat sharply, "why some gentle enthusiast doesn't propose that Independence Hall and Faneuil and Mount Vernon be torn down and made into a composite shed and turret for the Columbian Liberty bell."[23]

Mrs. Grover Cleveland was originally scheduled to press the button that would start casting the mold. Early in June, 1893, a committee of persons who had been active in the scheme travelled to the foundry at Troy, New York, to witness the event. Unfortunately, the day before the appointed time the mold fell into a hole, and all work was delayed for a week. Nevertheless, the delegation seems to have had a pleasant trip, especially as a prominent D.A.R. leader gave its members a big party at her home in nearby Saratoga Springs.

[22]*Newark Evening News,* May 10, 1893.
[23]*New York Sun,* May 14, 1893.

At the end of August, 1893, the bell was finally shipped down the Hudson River. It stood seven feet high and was over seven feet in diameter, requiring forty men to move it from the boat to the pier, where throngs of curious persons inspected it. The bell was then taken about the city on a large decorated truck drawn by six horses, whereupon the Pennsylvania Railroad shipped it free of charge to Chicago. After its arrival there McDowell reported in jubilation, "We have the position of honor at the fair and it is one constant ovation."[24] On September 20 a representative of each religious faith in the world sounded the bell "in the name of peace, unity and liberty of all religions, and at the same time repeated a silent prayer to their respective divinities, asking blessings on the bell."[25]

A man named George S. Knapp agreed to become the bell's custodian for a salary of twenty dollars a week. Plans now included a tour around the world, beginning with a visit to the Atlanta Exposition of 1895. On September 12 of that year a ceremony at the Chicago City Hall marked a resumption of the bell's travels. Thirteen horses, representing the thirteen original states, then pulled it to the station. Just as it was about to be loaded on to a special railroad car, the bell was legally attached because the sum of three hundred dollars was still lacking to complete payment for the car. Knapp paid the amount himself and started for Georgia with only fifteen dollars in his pocket. For four months after his arrival he and his son lived in a boxcar on the exposition grounds, with only a single blanket underneath them and only an American flag to cover them. By this time the *New York Daily Tribune* was calling the bell "a poor imitation gotten up for a showman's purpose and trundled around the country here and there, on a par as a spectacle with the learned pig and the wild man of Borneo."[26]

Meanwhile, the bell had become the cause of some extremely complicated financial entanglements. In January, 1894, the committee handling the entire project admitted that it still owed $2,600 to the firm that had done the casting, but within a few days

[24]McDowell to Mary Desha, Sept. 11, 1893, Mary Desha Papers, in the Breckinridge Family Papers, Library of Congress.

[25]*New York Daily Tribune*, Sept. 21, 1893.

[26]*Ibid.*, Oct. 2, 1895.

McDowell was able to report, "We have paid the Meneely Bell Co. and are out of their debt, *Thank God!*"[27] But it soon developed that he had accomplished this through some even more involved dealings. The committee had intended McDowell to borrow the necessary amount. Instead, he sold the bell outright to a company with whom he also made a contract to manufacture souvenir liberty bells. These he hoped to sell at fifteen dollars apiece to make up any deficit and was quite confident that between school children and members of the D.A.R., two groups whom he apparently considered equally gullible, he would have no difficulty making numerous sales.

By the spring of 1896 the committee had become so suspicious of how McDowell had handled the finances that it forced him to resign his position as chairman and to allow auditors to go over his accounts. One of them, a gentleman named J. Howard Foote, soon announced that the auditors had discovered "the most intricate mass of so-called accounts that ever existed."[28] As for McDowell's conduct, "You can form no idea of the recklessness with which he has handled the funds," he declared, "and when we get to the bottom of this most extraordinary scheme, it will be a story more like fiction than like fact."[29] But before he could get to the bottom, Mr. Foote found it all too much for him. Falling ill, as a friend presently reported, he "raved incessantly against this fellow McDowell and every now and then rained down imprecations upon him in his delirium. He died, finally, in a straight [*sic*] jacket; struggling with his enemy, whom he thought to be upon him."[30]

At first the committee hoped to keep secret this embarrassing financial mess, but one of the firms whom McDowell owed brought everything out in the open. In sending out an appeal to rescue the bell from debt, he had thereby incurred a further debt of six hundred dollars for the printing, and the company now demanded an accounting of the money he had received in reply. An auditing committee testified in court that altogether McDowell had collected about thirty-one thousand dollars, both

[30]Edward Summer to Mary Desha, May 22, 1896, *ibid.*

[27]McDowell to Mary Desha, Jan. 26, 1894, Desha Papers.
[28]J. Howard Foote to Mary Desha, April 18, 1896, *ibid.*
[29]Foote to Mary Desha, April 27, 1896, *ibid.*

for the original bell and for the proposed souvenirs, but that it was absolutely impossible to discover what had happened to about $10,000 of this. A number of D.A.R. members now complained indignantly that they had paid for the souvenir bells but had never received them, and the resultant newspaper publicity caused most people who had been connected with the movement to disassociate themselves as rapidly as possible. All this makes one wonder how successfully McDowell had handled complicated railroad re-organizations in earlier years and may explain his difficulties with the Sea Beach Railroad. McDowell, however, did not allow himself to become downhearted, as lesser men might have done. As he wrote to his old friend, Miss Desha, "I cannot bring myself to believe that Providence means the World's Liberty Bell to fail. Believing as I do the story of Christ, I can understand that suffering may be the lot of those who dare to give themselves to a great cause."[31]

As for the bell itself, it remained in the possession of George Knapp, who claimed he was owed $5,000 for having taken care of it all this time, and the last anything was heard of it, it was resting in his home in Chicago. The entire episode, of course, had gotten fantastically out of hand, but it should be pointed out that essentially McDowell was merely anticipating the more recent idea of a Freedom Train and that the support he received from so many prominent figures in the new hereditary societies showed how significant such patriotic symbolism had become.

McDowell, of course, was not long without a new interest. This time it was the idea of establishing a National University in Washington, D.C. This proposal particularly appealed to many members of hereditary societies because it had been favored by George Washington. When Mrs. Aldai E. Stevenson was president of the D.A.R., she appointed a committee to work for Congressional action. McDowell's chief ally in this crusade was Henry Baldwin, a resident of New Haven, Connecticut and Atlantic City, who belonged to a number of hereditary societies and had written a manuscript history of the S.A.R. Baldwin was also a strong nativist and served on the New Jersey com-

[31]McDowell to Mary Desha, Dec. 21, 1896, *ibid.*

mittee of the American Protective Association, the violently anti-immigrant and and anti-Catholic organization of the 1890's.[32] Having become friendly with McDowell, he contributed financially toward many of McDowell's schemes. At a conference of nativist groups held in Chicago in February, 1891, McDowell bestowed on Baldwin the impressive title of "Custodian of American History." As Custodian, all that Baldwin was supposed to do was "to verify all the facts of American History."[33] He was also to collect what was called a "Library Americana," which presumably was to be the nucleus for the library of the proposed National University.

To secure funds for the institution, in the late 1890's McDowell induced Baldwin to invest twenty thousand dollars in a machine which he and one Erastus E. Ford had invented, which supposedly enabled one to beat the stock market. Mr. McDowell's son recalls it as anticipating present-day IBM machines. By feeding into it the statistics of a stock's past performance, it would predict its future course. As McDowell wrote to Baldwin, "When you and your son had investigated and you brought your twenty thousand dollars to New York with you, it seemed to me that God in his own way was through you and Mr. Ford starting the ball rolling that would bring into existence what Washington had wanted, just right."[34] Unfortunately, Baldwin seems to have been overly credulous. Even McDowell had to admit within a few months, "I am more and more impressed with the fact that Mr. Ford is a great genius, but not in every particular a good business man."[35] By the turn of the century Baldwin's twenty thousand dollars were all dissipated, and he and McDowell were debating whether to prefer criminal charges against the "great genius." McDowell did not indicate what he thought this now showed as to God's opinion of the National University. In any case, McDowell's advocacy of the cause had probably hurt it as much as it had helped. When the S.A.R.'s national convention

[32]For Baldwin's nativist activities, see John Higham, "The Mind of a Nativist: Henry F. Bowers and the A.P.A.," *American Quarterly*, IV (Spring, 1952), p. 21*n*.

[33]Form letter issuel by McDowell, Sept., 1898, Henry Baldwin Scrapbooks, New York Public Library.

[34]McDowell to Henry Baldwin, July 1, 1898, *ibid.*

[35]McDowell to Baldwin, Feb. 27, 1899, *ibid.*

was asked to endorse the project in 1898, the president of the New Jersey Sons at once announced, "If there be the slightest suspicion that this man McDowell has anything to do with this resolution, I move that it be laid on the table."[36] To emphasize his remarks he stamped his feet on the floor with great vigor, and the motion was abandoned.

For McDowell, however, there were still other causes. For a while in the late 1890's he became aroused for Cuban independence and supported a group known as the Cuban League of the United States, showering President McKinley with what we may assume to have been unsolicited advice, though by this time experience had convinced even McDowell of the advisability of "keeping my name entirely in the background."[37] He was also invited to meeting of the "Peace, Purity and Plenty" movement, whose headquarters were in Philadelphia on, appropriately enough, Spring Garden Street and whose motto was "Ripe Fruit and Pure Food." In the early 20th century he turned to the lecture platform, speaking on such familiar themes as "The Expansion of the Democratic Spirit, or Liberty Enlightening the World" and "Cuba and Her Future Relations to the United States." All his fees, he claimed, were to go toward spreading democracy throughout the world.

But especially he became interested in working for world peace. His old Human Freedom League of the early 1890's had included international arbitration among its objectives and had appointed him a delegate to an international peace conference at Rome in 1891. He had been unable to go, but a lady named Mrs. Mary Frost Ormsby did attend, taking with her a peace flag which McDowell was to have given the meeting in behalf of the Human Freedom League. Mrs. Ormsby carefully reported to McDowell what had happened. "I have *faithfully* performed the *commission* you gave me to *fulfill,*" she wrote to him. "I presented the *Flag of Peace* to the Congress on the second day of its session, and it was at once placed in a most *prominent*

[36]Sons of the American Revolution, *National Year Book 1898* (New York, n.d.), p. 76.

[37]McDowell to Mary Desha, Dec. 21, 1896, Desha Papers.

position, which strange to say, without any particular intent, proved to be *the arms* of a *'Dying Gladiator'."*[38]

McDowell later became friendly with Alfred H. Love of Philadelphia, president of the Universal Peace Union, and as a result spoke to various peace groups and eventually became a vice-president of the Union. As a first step toward world government he favored closer relations with Great Britain, hoping a postal union between it and the United States would lead to further joint activity. Hence one of his lecture topics in the early 1900's was "The Coming Political Union of the English-Speaking World," though for those who found that distasteful he also had a talk on "What the Irish Have Accomplished for Liberty." Finally he prepared a document, first published in the *Journal of American History* in 1908, whose title is interesting in light of subsequent developments, for it was called "The Constitution of the United Nations of the World," which, among other things, provided for a world executive known as "The Peacemaker." His claim that this was the basis for the later League of Nations First World War was a great blow to him, and he engaged in received credence in some circles, and as a result it is said that at one time he was nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize. The futile pleas for peace to various leaders, such as the one he issued on Christmas Day, 1915, to Pope Benedict XV, President Wilson, Andrew Carnegie, and the International Red Cross. Understandably, he became a great admirer of Woodrow Wilson's internationalism, and later he felt great sympathy for Wilson as a martyr who was suffering the same rebuffs that he himself had experienced earlier. These interests so filled McDowell's later years that at the time of his death the newspaper accounts identified him primarily as a leader in the peace movement.

McDowell lived on until March 12, 1927, when he died at his home in Newark from what was described as the infirmities of old age; he was not quite seventy-nine years old. In retrospect, William O. McDowell was in many ways a fantastic individual, filled as he was with incredible energy for promoting impractical

[38]Mary Frost Ormsby to McDowell, Nov. 17, 1891, "The Flag of Human Freedom League in Rome," *Home and Country,* VII (Dec., 1891), p. 1662.

schemes. At the same time, he helped to found two of the most permanent and important hereditary patriotic societies in this country, the S.A.R. and D.A.R., whose success set the pace for many other similar groups. There were many contradictory elements in him. Much of his activity seems to have included a strong desire for personal fame; his exaggerations meant that he was never entirely reliable; his financial transactions were nonchalant to an extent that leaves one wondering exactly how to evaluate them. But the fact remains that there was also through his entire career a solid basis of idealistic belief in spreading American principles of self-government throughout the world, in improving the lot of the working classes, largely through labor unions, and in the possibility of international peace and world government which present-day members of patriotic societies might do well to recall and the critics of such groups to understand.

Charles Sumner and the New Jersey Railroad Monopoly during the Civil War

DAVID F. TRASK

The saga of the Camden and Amboy Railroad is a most fascinating portion of New Jersey history. One of the least-known aspects of its long career is the railroad's protracted struggle with the United States Congress during the Civil War. The Congressional attempt to destroy the exclusive privileges of the Camden and Amboy on rail transportation across New Jersey during this period was of great importance in the development of American attitudes toward interstate commerce. Another interesting aspect of the controversy was the role played by Senator Charles Sumner of Massachusetts. For these reasons, a study of this episode is of more than passing interest to New Jersey historians.

The Camden and Amboy exerted a tremendous influence over railroad transportation within the state of New Jersey during the period 1830-1870. The railway was able to establish and maintain one of the most powerful monopolies ever to function in the United States. Running southwest from South Amboy to Camden, a distance of slightly more than sixty-one miles, it provided connections by ferry to New York City and Philadelphia, but its own right of way was entirely within the bounds of New Jersey. A series of statutes passed by the state legislature during the railroad's first decade conferred an iron-clad monopoly over its route. Its location combined with its monopoly enabled the Camden and Amboy to control most of the commerce crossing New Jersey. Shipments to the west and south

The Author has an A.B. degree from Wesleyan College, Connecticut, 1951, A.M. from Harvard, 1952, and a Ph.D. expected this year. Presently instructor in political economy at Boston University, he is one of the compilers of *A Select Bibliography for Students of History* (1957).

had to follow the Camden and Amboy or else proceed along circuitous routes which consumed more time and resulted in exorbitant costs.

The monopoly used diverse methods to avoid competition. The Delaware and Raritan Canal, a potential competitor for traffic across the state, was united with the Camden and Amboy under a joint board of directors. Henceforth the combination was known as the "Joint Companies." Another threat to the monopoly, the New Jersey Railroad, was rendered harmless by an agreement between the two roads. In other cases, the Joint Companies prevented the development of competition by blocking the issuance of charters to would-be rivals by the New Jersey legislature. The monopoly became so influential in state politics that New Jersey became known by the opprobrium, "State of the Camden and Amboy." Rarely has the politics of any state become so entwined with the affairs of an individual enterprise.[1]

The Civil War, however, inaugurated a chain of events which led eventually to the downfall of this seemingly omnipotent monopoly. The Civil War immediately enhanced the importance of the Camden and Amboy to the nation, because it was an essential link in the line of communications from the heavily populated industrial centers of the Northeast to the battlefields of Virginia. The failure of the monopoly to fulfill its public responsibilities during the great conflict led to a concentrated attack on it by members of the Congress of the United States, in particular Senator Charles Sumner of Massachusetts whose role in this matter has never been adequately explained.

I. Background of the Struggle

The struggle between the New Jersey monopoly and Congress must be seen as an aspect of larger political, constitutional, and economic struggles on the national scene. The essential point at issue was whether or not the particular interest of an individual enterprise and a single state were to triumph over the general interests of the nation. During the first half of the nineteenth

[1]For the history of the monopoly prior to the Civil War consult Wheaton J. Lane, *From Indian Trail to Iron Horse: Travel and Transportation in New Jersey, 1620-1860* (Princeton, 1939), pp. 253-326; Roger Avery Barton, "The Camden and Amboy Railroad Monopoly," *New Jersey Historical Society Proceedings*, N.S., XII (1927), 406; J. K. Medbury, "The New Jersey Monopolies," *North American Review*, CIV (1867), 449.

century, state legislatures often granted monopolies over rights of way to encourage entrepreneurs who desired to construct and develop transportation facilities. Once granted, it was possible for recipients to abuse their privileges. In normal times such abuses were difficult to counteract, but in times of emergency, concentrated public disapproval sometimes encouraged attempts at corrective action. Such was the case with the Camden and Amboy. Under the stress of public pressure during the Civil War to improve services and reduce charges, the Joint Companies preferred to adopt legal defenses centering on restrictive interpretations of the commerce and contract clauses in the federal Constitution. The debates over the interpretation of these clauses foreshadowed many of the discussions which eventually culminated in the passage of the Interstate Commerce Act of 1887. This aspect of the dispute over the New Jersey monopoly during the Civil War has not received adequate attention from historians.

A clearcut interpretation of the commerce clause was necessary; otherwise the expansion of the United States into the Great West could not continue without untoward difficulties. The day of the transcontinental railroad was almost at hand. Could individual states interfere with the attempts of the government in Washington to underwrite huge developments in transportation to the West? Would the nation adhere to interpretations of the contract and commerce clauses which would inhibit economic expansion? These questions were clearly in the minds of the men who debated the issue of the New Jersey monopoly in Congress during the Civil War. Although the immediate concern was the pressing problem of insuring unimpeded communications from north to south, thus permitting men and materiel to move freely to the Army of the Potomac, the broader issue loomed large in the background.

Many derogatory charges were brought against the Camden and Amboy in the period prior to the Civil War. The Road was accused of failing to provide safe service, up-to-date facilities, reasonable rates, rapid running times, and adequate terminals. Its detractors, including the well-known economist, Henry C. Carey, maintained that it was preventing the development of other transportation facilities in New Jersey in order to avoid

the necessity of improving services in the face of competition.[2] The obvious conflict between the prevailing economic dogmas of free private enterprise, based on the idea of competition, and the monopoly, which inhibited competition, was a source of serious embarrassment to the managers of the Camden and Amboy. Its opponents were able to develop an impressive theoretical and practical case against the monopoly, but its political power and its appeal to selfish interests made it virtually unassailable from within the state. To destroy the monopoly, national pressure had to be applied. The Civil War created the subjective and objective conditions necessary to make such an attack feasible. The people of other northern states were in no mood to permit a monopoly to jeopardize the war effort, especially one so notorious as the Camden and Amboy.[3]

The story of the Congressional attempt to destroy the New Jersey monopoly takes on added significance when seen as an aspect of the concentrated effort to establish national supremacy over interstate commerce. The New Jersey monopolists decided to utilize the states' rights tactic as the heart of their defense. To do so was to invite the wrath of those who viewed the war as an attack on those principles, so powerfully expressed by the South in defense of their "peculiar institution."

II. The New Jersey Monopoly, 1861-1864

The Civil War did not halt the commercial expansion of the United States. The Republican Party, firmly established as the Party of Union, favored high tariffs, a national banking system, a controlled currency, subsidies for transcontinental railroads, and other inducements to manufacturing and transportation.[4] In addition, the great need for railroads and canals to serve as

[2]There is a tremendous literature dealing with these matters, as well as much comment in contemporary newspapers. See for example Henry C. Carey (A Citizen of Burlington, *pseud.*) *Beauties of the Monopoly System of New Jersey* (Philadelphia, 1848); *Address of the Joint Board of Directors of the Delaware and Raritan Canal and the Camden and Amboy Railroad Companies, to the People of New Jersey* (Trenton, 1848).

[3]See Emory Johnson, et al., *History of the Domestic and Foreign Commerce of the United States*, Vol. I (Washington, 1922), and B. H. Meyer, et al., *History of Transportation in the United States before 1860* (Washington, 1917).

[4]Emerson D. Fite, *Social and Industrial Conditions in the North durnig the Civil War* (New York, 1910), p. 78.

THE AMERICAN SCENE IN DECORATIVE ARTS. Pitcher inspired by the presidential election of 1840, showing candidate Harrison and the famed log cabin. Made by the American Pottery Manufacturing Company, Jersey City. *(Newark Museum photo.)*

military communications stimulated the growth of transportation.[5] The expanding economy, based on long term trends as well as the immediate pressure of war, brought railroad problems increasingly to the attention of Congress.

Congress took note of the Camden and Amboy when the monopoly refused to allow a rival, the Raritan and Delaware Bay Railroad, to carry some of the north-south commerce during the early years of the war. The Raritan and Delaware Bay offered a longer but nevertheless practical connection through New Jersey between New York and Washington. A weak and struggling railroad, it was moved to bid for some of the war business by the failure of the Camden and Amboy to operate efficiently in the face of the emergency. The huge volume of troop movements and freight needed in the Virginia theater of operations taxed the monopoly beyond its capacities. Long delays and irksome errors soon drew fire from politicians and merchants outside New Jersey.[6] The Camden and Amboy instituted legal action and succeeded in obtaining an injunction which prevented the Raritan and Delaware Bay from transporting interstate commerce across New Jersey. This event occurred early in 1864, and the controversy between the monopoly and its opponents reached its greatest intensity. Both sides prepared for a decisive passage at arms.

The task of defeating the monopoly was clearly a very difficult undertaking, because sentiment within New Jersey strongly favored the Joint Companies, New Jersey politics during the Civil War were determined by three primary forces—pro-monopoly opinion, anti-war feeling, and states' rights proclivities.[7] The Camden and Amboy dominated the Democratic party organization in New Jersey, which was tantamount to dominating the state. The Democrats elected Joel Parker as governor in 1862 and delivered New Jersey's electoral vote to George B. McClellan in 1864. The monopoly curried favor

[5]Emerson D. Fite, "The Canal and the Railroad from 1861 to 1865," *Yale Review*, XV (1906), 195-213.

[6]"Railroad Communication between New York and Washington," *Hunt's Merchants' Magazine*, XLVI (1862), 73-74.

[7]Charles M. Knapp, *New Jersey Politics during the Period of the Civil War and Reconstruction* (Geneva, N.Y., 1924), p. 109.

within the state by extending favors to state legislators and officials and also by offering a cheaper schedule of rates for intrastate commerce than for interstate commerce, a policy designed to appeal to local merchants and manufacturers. A small but vocal anti-monopoly faction existed within New Jersey led by Mr. James Scovel of Camden, but Scovel and his compatriots never were successful in undertakings against the Camden and Amboy within New Jersey. It was not surprising that anti-monopoly attentions turned to Washington for action.[8] Horace Greeley, the pugnacious editor of the New York *Daily Tribune,* was very active in the campaign against the Camden and Amboy from his vantage point in the great metropolis. He was assiduous in urging Congressional action in no uncertain terms: " . . . let us entreat Congress to relieve the commerce of our City, and of three-fourths of the country, from the extortions of that most unrighteous and merciless Monopoly . . . lovers of justice and fair play in either house! unbar the prison gates and let the oppressed go free!"[9]

The first tactic of the anti-monopolists in their campaign to destroy the monopoly by Congressional action was to press for the construction of an alternate federal military and post road across New Jersey. The Constitution appeared to authorize such action although the Supreme Court had failed to clarify the issues involved.[10] In addition, Congress had given President Lincoln power to seize all telegraph and rail lines in 1862. However, the project to construct a new railroad proved impractical. Attention now turned to the possibility of rehabilitating the Raritan and Delaware Bay by declaring it a federal military and post road. Opinion in the North was hardening against the New Jersey monopoly. The *New York Times* said, it was "idle to hope for any essential improvement from the managers of the existing roads, so long as they have nothing to fear from competition."[11]

Early in 1864, the House of Representatives in Washington

[8]See Scovel's letter to the editor in the *New York Daily Tribune,* 11 April 1864.
[9]*New York Daily Tribune,* 9 February 1864.
[10]"The Congress shall have power . . . To establish Post Offices and Post Roads." *Constitution,* Article I, Section 8.
[11]*New York Times,* 6 February 1863.

chose a select committee to investigate and report on the possibility of declaring the Raritan and Delaware Bay Railroad a military and post road by act of Congress. The committee soon reported a bill to accomplish this end.[12] An acrimonious controversy ensued almost immediately. Speeches, editorials, pamphlets and other media of communication were utilized by both sides to influence public opinion. This discussion served to develop many of the points of view later utilized in the congressional debates.

Governor Joel Parker of New Jersey reacted immediately to the action of the select committee in Washington by sending a message to the state legislature attacking the bill before Congress. He argued that the power to declare the Raritan and Delaware Bay a military and postal road already existed by virtue of President Lincoln's extraordinary war powers, that the object of the bill was not to improve facilities for the war effort but to crush the monopoly, and that such action violated the Constitution since it infringed on powers reserved to the states.[13] The legislature responded by passing a series of resolutions holding that the bill attempted to confer rights and privileges on the Raritan and Delaware Bay not authorized by New Jersey (the only sovereign authority legally allowed to take such action), that it would constitute a slur on the Court of Chancery of New Jersey whose injunction had halted interstate commerce along the Raritan and Delaware Bay, and that it violated a solemn contract between New Jersey and the Joint Companies.[14]

The proponents of the anti-monopoly bill before Congress cited numerous legal precedents to buttress their arguments, but depended primarily on their assertion that failure to enact the bill would inhibit the development of interstate commerce, not only in New Jersey but throughout the country. They argued that the bill would demonstrate Congressional interest in the development of American commerce and establish a powerful precedent in behalf of Congressional powers over commerce

[12]*Congressional Globe,* 38th Congress, 1st Session, Part I, 36, 100, 108.

[13]The speech is quoted in part in Knapp, *op. cit.,* pp. 112-13.

[14]The resolutions are printed in *New York Times,* 26 March 1864.

[15]*Reasons Why the Raritan and Delaware Bay Railroad Company Should Not Be Destroyed by the Camden and Amboy Monopoly* (Washington, 1864), pp. 9-11.

among the several states.[15] As the debate developed the anti-monopolists tended more and more to rely on this position.[16]

The Camden and Amboy was very active in Washington, supporting a powerful lobby to defend its interests. Its lawyers filed a carefully prepared brief against the anti-monopolists, emphasizing that only the state of New Jersey had the right to grant and revoke charter privileges, and that the Camden and Amboy Railroad was not engaged in interstate commerce because it began and ended within New Jersey. The monopoly was, they argued, a great artificial highway entirely within and created by New Jersey, and as such was immune from Congressional regulation.[17] They found it necessary to refute the use of the famous case of Gibbons versus Ogden (1824) which pointed toward exclusive Congressional jurisdiction over interstate commerce. The case, however, had involved a natural rather than an artificial highway, and Chief Justic Marshall, who rendered the opinion, carefully excluded intrastate commerce from its effect. Later opinions, especially the Passenger and License cases, had confused the interpretation of the commerce clause. In 1851 the situation was somewhat clarified by Cooley versus the Board of Wardens which seemed to recognize a concurrent state power over interstate commerce in the absence of Congressional action.

Despite the preoccupation with legal arguments that characterized the debate over the New Jersey monopoly, it is important to note that questions of expediency really dominated the opinions of the disputants. The pro-monopoly faction was forced to rely on states' rights arguments and appeals to the selfish interests of Jerseymen. They were at a decided disadvantage in the face of the growing wave of national protest against the Camden and Amboy.

Behind the invective heaped on the monopoly was one particular motivation which overshadowed the particular interests of individuals and groups—the desire to foster the development

[16]William Allen Butler and Edwards Pierrepont, *Railway Communication between New York and Washington* (New York, 1864), p. 9.

[17]*Points against the Raritan and Delaware Bay and Camden and Atlantic Railroad Application* (Washington, 1864).

of free and unrestricted commerce throughout the country. Perhaps Horace Greeley caught this spirit as well as anyone.

> What is needed is not some beggarly privilege of carrying mails, troops and munitions, over a particular road—but freedom for all the people of the whole country to cross the State of New-Jersey by the most eligible and convenient route—and not New-Jersey only, but *every* State. We wish Congress would . . . pass an act which would prevent all such monopolies as that now enjoyed by the Camden and Amboy Company, not in New-Jersey only, but throughout the country. Let all such Companies be fairly notified that bribing legislatures to grant them monopolies will be utterly futile—that Congress will override them, even should it be necessary, to that end, to charter a company to build a road outright. Break up the present odious and most oppressive monopoly; but do it, if possible, by an act that will forever prevent the creation of such another.[18]

Congress now attempted to find a solution for the momentous problem of monopolies. In so doing, they dealt with a truly national problem although the matter at issue was a case involving a particular state. It was fitting that a great debate should transpire, even in the midst of the Civil War.

III. Congressional Debates, 1864-66

When the select committee reported its bill on the floor of the House in March, 1864, the Representatives almost immediately inaugurated debate. Representative Rogers of New Jersey, one of the principal Camden and Amboy agents in Washington, made the first comprehensive defense of the monopoly. He stressed the position previously adumbrated by Governor Parker and the New Jersey legislature—that Congress might legitimately regulate commerce on "natural" highways between states, but not on "artificial" highways created by the states entirely within state boundaries. For Congress to attempt to regulate the latter would be, he held, a contravention of the due process clause of the Fifth Amendment. This statement is striking; it is a remarkably early effort to apply a substantive as opposed to procedural interpretation of that Amendment.[19]

A battery of anti-monopoly orators followed, including Representative Garfield of Ohio, later to become the twentieth

[18] *New York Daily Tribune*, 21 February 1864.
[19] *Congressional Globe*, 38th Congress, 1st Session, Part II, 1237-43.

President of the United States. They relied principally on argument from expediency, that the Camden and Amboy had failed to provide proper services across the New Jersey and that the monopoly threatened the uninhibited development of interstate commerce.[20] Garfield communicated their mood very well, stating, "The legislature of New Jersey has done what perhaps it had the right to do. I do not interfere with that, and I do not ask this House to legislate for New Jersey, but for the Union."[21]

Meanwhile Representative Wilson of Iowa introduced legislation of a much more general and sweeping nature than that of the select committee which merely declared the Raritan and Delaware Bay a military and post road. Wilson's bill permitted any steam railroad in the United States to transport freight and passengers for one state to another, despite any state legislation to the contrary.[22] It was a direct affirmation of Congressional supremacy in the realm of interstate commerce, an affirmation such as Greeley had called for in the New York *Daily Tribune*. The anti-monopolists henceforth concentrated their efforts on the passage of the Wilson bill because it clearly raised the basic issue and could also be used against other monopolies similar to the Camden and Amboy.

At this time, Senator Charles Sumner of Massachusetts introduced a resolution into the Senate embodying the same principle, but it did not appear on the calendar during the session due to the press of their business connected with the War.[23] The anti-monopolists were cleverly out-maneuvered by the pro-monopoly faction who adopted Fabian tactics, hoping to kill the bill by delay.

Senator Sumner's connection with the anti-monopoly legislation is of more than passing interest. His letter books, in the Houghton Library of Harvard University, contain a number of letters from anti-monopoly leaders. James M. Scovel, the New Jersey leader, wrote at this time, pointing out that the

[20] *Ibid.*, Part 4 (Appendix), 79-82; *Ibid.*, Part 2, 1264-65, 1371-73.
[21] *Ibid.*, p. 1365.
[22] *Ibid.*, p. 1734.
[23] *Ibid.*, p. 1840.
[24] Sumner Manuscripts (Houghton Library, Harvard University), Vol. 68, No. 68, letter of 6 May 1864. Further references are to Sumner MSS.

Camden and Amboy delaying tactics could be frustrated only by corresponding pressure for action.[24] Frank W. Ballard, a Republican leader in New York City, informed Sumner that the monopoly was spending an estimated $2500 a day supporting a huge lobby in Washington.[25]

The anti-monopoly leaders in the House finally brought the Wilson bill to a vote in May, and it passed by a vote of sixty-three to fifty-seven. The vote split along party lines; sixty of sixty-nine Republicans voting for it and forty-eight of fifty-one Democrats against it.[26] Apparently the proximity of the 1864 elections influenced the balloting; the "War Democrats" had not surrendered their traditional allegiance to the doctrines of states' rights, although unwilling to follow the South into rebellion.

The Senate, however, adjourned before the bill could be taken up. Horace Greeley plaintively pleaded for its consideration during the waning days of the session, but to no avail.[27] For the moment at least the Camden and Amboy monopoly was sustained.

The second session of the Thirty-Eighth Congress convened in December, 1864, and the anti-monopoly leaders immediately returned to the lists, determined to force the Wilson bill through the Senate. Debate began on 16 January 1865. Senator Chandler of Michigan, who introduced the bill, contended that New Jersey was interfering with the exclusive power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce.[28] Senator Saulsbury of Delaware came to the defense of the Camden and Amboy, reiterating their claim that the Wilson bill violated a solemn contract between the railroad and New Jersey.[29] Thus the constitutional issue was posed almost at once—the debate was to turn on the nature of the federal-state relationship regarding the regulation of interstate commerce.

A few days later, Senator Reverdy Johnson of Maryland, a

[25] *Ibid.*, No. 75, letter of 9 May 1864.

[26] *Congressional Globe,* 38th Congress, 1st Session, Part III, 2264. Members of splinter parties were arbitrarily classified as Democrats or Republicans on the basis of information in *Biographical Dictionary of the American Congress, 1774-1949.*

[27] *New York Daily Tribune,* 18 May 1864.

[28] *Congressional Globe,* 38th Congress, 2nd Session, Part 1, 270.

[29] *Ibid.*

great orator and lawyer, rose in defense of the Camden and Amboy. The Wilson bill threatened a monopoly similar to that of the Camden and Amboy within his own state, and he was anxious to prevent its passage. Johnson's speech was a masterpiece of rhetoric and reasoning. He began by holding that the word "establish" in the post roads clause referred only to existing roads. Congress might declare a road already built a military and postal road, but it could not construct one of its own. For authority Johnson cited President Monroe's famous message on internal improvements which held that Congress could appropriate money for such improvements but could not build them without the consent of the states involved. Therefore the Senator inferred that states possessed the reserved power to determine the characteristics of railroads within their jurisdictions. This power New Jersey had exercised in granting a charter to the Camden and Amboy Railroad which contained a monopoly grant. The charter was an "executed contract" and as such could not be legally abrogated by any sovereign, a point established by Chief Justice Marshall in the Dartmouth College Case (1819). The present legislation, said Johnson, proposed to alter a charter without the consent of the interested parties, and consequently was manifestly illegal.[30]

Buoyed up by Senator Johnson's brilliant speech, the advocates of the monopoly took heart and refurbished the tactics of 1864—the technique of delay. Greeley stormed in New York City, but the huge volume of war business worked in favor of the Camden and Amboy.[31]

Meanwhile, Senator Sumner was preparing a frontal attack on the New Jersey monopoly, one calculated to dramatize the issue as no other speech had done. As in 1864, he was in touch with anti-monopoly leaders who kept him informed about new developments.[32] On 14 February 1865 Sumner rose to deliver his epic oration, one that exhibited all the power and strength of such previous efforts as "The Crime Against Kansas" and "The

[30]*Ibid.*, pp. 328-32.

[31]*New York Daily Tribune*, 8 February 1865.

[32]Letter from Scovel is in Sumner MSS, Vol. 72, No. 40, and one from Ballard is in *Ibid.*, No. 65.

Wrong of Slavery," two of his best-known speeches against the slave power.

Sumner posed the issue boldly in his opening remarks. "Thus stands the question at the outset; public convenience and the Union itself in its beneficient powers on the one side; public inconvenience and all the discord of intolerable State pretensions on the other side."[33]

The Senator proceeded to examine most of the arguments brought up for and against the monopoly. It was certainly the most comprehensive of all Congressional pronouncements on the New Jersey monopoly. New Jersey, he said, was an essential link in the national system of interstate commerce; it was intolerable that the state should interfere with its flow. New Jersey levied a transit tax against interstate commerce. Sumner called this practice illegal because the power to tax, in Chief Justice Marshall's famous formulation, conferred the power to destroy, a power the Constitution did not confer upon the states in connection with interstate commerce. "No usurping monopoly," he cried, "should be allowed to establish itself across the national highway, and like a baron of the Middle Ages perched in his rocky fastness, levy toll and tribute upon the wayfarers of business, pleasure, or duty."[34]

Sumner realized that Reverdy Johnson's speech had made a profound impression; consequently he attacked it point by point. He cited Justices Marshall and Story in support of his contention that the commerce clause gave Congress complete authority over interstate commerce. He denied that the word "establish" in the post roads clause prevented Congress from constructing its own roads, quoting Justice Story once again as authority. He refuted Johnson's statement that traffic along the Camden and Amboy was intrastate commerce because the road was completely within the bounds of New Jersey, maintaining that the Camden and Amboy was merely a link in a long chain of railroads constituting a system engaged in interstate commerce. He rejected the contract argument ingeniously, holding that the words, "No State shall pass any law impairing the ob-

[33]Charles Sumner, *Works*, IX (Boston, 1875), 238.
[34]*Ibid.*, p. 244.

ligation of contracts," applied only to states, but did not control Congress. Congress, he held, exercised the power of eminent domain, and any powers held by the states were subordinate to those of Congress. Even if the projected bill destroyed the sovereignty of the states, which was not true according to Sumner, the "supreme law of the land" clause was sufficient justification for ignoring the argument. In ringing words, Sumner attacked Johnson's concept of states' rights.

> In his ardor for that vampire monopoly, which, brooding over New Jersey, sucks the life-blood of the whole country, the Senator from Maryland sets up most dangerous pretensions in the name of State rights. Sir, the Senator flings into one scale the pretensions of State rights; into the other scale I fling the Union itself.[35]

Sumner now turned to more general concerns, making an attack on the idea of monopoly. He claimed that the Constitution did not give states the authority to confer monopolies, and cited Daniezl Webster's famous brief in the case of Gibbons versus Ogden as his justification. Referring to John Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress,* he compared commerce to Christian, the hero of that work, and the monopoly to Appolyon, the villain in the piece, who tried to waylay Christian in the Valley of Humiliation, which in Sumner's analogy was obviously New Jersey.

Having run the gamut of argument, Sumner concluded by restating his major premise, that monopoly protected by the pretensions of state sovereignty threatened the future development of the country.

> If there be any single fruit of our national unity, if there be any single element of the Union, if there be any single triumph of the Constitution to be placed above all others, it is the freedom of commerce between the States, under which *free trade,* the aspiration of philosophy, is assured to all citizens of the Union, as they circulate through our whole broad country, without hindrance from any State. But this vital principle is now in jeopardy . . .
>
> Thank God, within the bounds of the Union, under the National Constitution, commerce is made free . . . And yet the State of New Jersey asserts the power of closing a highway of the Union.
>
> Such a pretension, so irrational and destructive, must not be dealt with tenderly. Like the serpent, it must be bruised on the head. Nor can there

[35] *Ibid.,* p. 257.

be wise delay. Every moment of life yielded to such Usurpation is like the concession once in an evil hour yielded to Nullification, kindred in origin and character. The present pretension of New Jersey belongs to the same school with that abhorred and blood-spattered pretension of South Carolina.

. . . The monopoly founded on the hideous pretension of property in man obtained responsive sympathy in that other monopoly founded on the greed of unjust taxation, and both were naturally upheld in the name of State Rights. Both must be overthrown in the name of the Union. South Carolina must cease to be a Slave State, and New Jersey must also cease her disturbing pretension. All hail to the genius of Universal Emancipation! All hail to the Union, victorious over the Rebellion,—victorious, also, over a Usurpation which menaces the unity of the Republic![36]

With this challenging peroration Sumner rested the anti-monopoly case. Henceforth the anti-monopolists pressed for the vote. James Scovel, Edwards Pierrepont, and other supporters wrote glowing letters of praise to Sumner.[37] Others were just as demonstrative in invective.[38]

Unfortunately, Sumner's great effort was to prove unavailing. Again the bill never was brought to a vote during the session. A combination of circumstances—the greatness of the issue, the press of business attending the end of the Civil War, the assassination of President Lincoln, the partisan character of the dispute, and the intrepid lobbying of the Camden and Amboy—all conspired to frustrate the anti-monopolists. The New Jersey monopoly again had managed to postpone the reckoning.

Why should Charles Sumner, involved at this time with all the intricacies of the Thirteenth Amendment, have been so willing to make such a concentrated attack on the Camden and Amboy? The question cannot be answered with certainty due to the lack of contemporary research on Sumner. A complete study of his career, written with the insights of the modern biographer, remains to be written. However, there are certain clear-cut indications as to the reasons for Sumner's action.[39]

[36] *Ibid.*, pp. 263-65.

[37] Scovel's letter of 16 February 1865 is in Sumner MSS, Vol. 72, No. 127. Letters from Pierrepont written 21 and 26 February are in *Ibid.*, No. 126 and No. 132.

[38] *Boston Daily Advertiser*, 16 February 1865.

[39] The official biography is E. L. Pierce, *Memoir and Letters of Charles Sumner* (4 v., Boston, 1877-93). The volume in the American Statesman Series is Morefield Storey, *Charles Sumner* (New York, 1900).

Sumner discerned a close connection between his attitudes toward slavery and the questions of national policy raised by the Camden and Amboy monopoly. The monopoly, like the South, depended on the states' rights tactic, which it utilized in its effort to protect a selfish interest which threatened the war effort. This attitude is crystallized in his speech against the Camden and Amboy. Then too, an examination of Sumner's previous career reveals that he had a general interest in the development of American transportation and commerce.[40] A particular interest in the destruction of the states' rights argument and a general interest in the expansion of American commerce thus flowed together in Sumner's mind; together they appear to have motivated his attack on the New Jersey monopoly. Without doubt, the partisan character of the debate had some influence on the Senator, who of course was one of the most important spokesmen of the Republican Party.

Despite the defeat of the Wilson bill in 1865, the days of the monopoly were numbered. In 1866 both Houses of Congress passed a bill which permitted the Raritan and Delaware Bay Railroad to compete with the Camden and Amboy.[41] It did not, however, establish the advanced position on interstate commerce stressed by the anti-monopolists. The bill authorized existing railroads in adjoining states to combine for the purpose of transporting goods in interstate commerce, but it did not permit construction of new roads or connections which did not have the approval of the states involved.[42] The opponents of the Camden and Amboy thus triumphed in their particular aim, the destruction of the New Jersey monopoly, but failed to achieve a clarification of the interpretation of the commerce and contract clauses which would lessen the threat of state interference with interstate commerce.

The legislation of 1866 enabled the Raritan and Delaware Bay Railroad to compete for traffic across New Jersey with the Camden and Amboy. The fortunes of the Joint Companies,

[40]See for speeches on railroads and canals, *Works*, III, 12-32, 228; *Ibid.*, VII, 121, 318-19, 320-21.

[41]*Congressional Globe*, 39th Congress, 1st Session, Part 4, 2921, 3240.

[42]L. H. Haney, *A Congressional History of Railways in the United States*, II (Madison, Wisconsin, 1910), 227.

until this moment so successful, now went into decline. In 1871 the holdings of the Camden and Amboy passed to the Pennsylvania Railroad. In 1873 the New Jersey legislature finally struck down the charter privileges, and the monopoly, so long the master of New Jersey, was finally banished from the land.[43]

IV. Conclusion

What accounts for the stumbling efforts of Congress in its efforts to crush the Camden and Amboy monopoly? In the first place, the country was still in the midst of westward expansion and the full importance of free commercial intercourse between the states was not yet clear. Secondly, the constitutional precedents were at best inconclusive, and the strongly legalistic bent of the average legislator probably caused some revulsion at the thought of voting for suspect legislation. The bicameral legislative arrangement had some effect in delaying action on the bills, as shown by the time lag between House and Senate approval. But perhaps the most reason was the activity of the defenders of the monopoly within New Jersey who utilized the arguments of state sovereignty very astutely. Only the growing awareness of the need for unrestricted commercial intercourse, particularly as advocated by the greatly strengthened postwar Republican Party, and the final subjugation of the great center of states' rights sentiment emboldened Congress to take decisive action. But nevertheless the agitation over the New Jersey monopoly resulted in a significant contribution to the theoretical and practical arguments which have come to be the basis for the modern interpretation of the commerce clause.

[43]Francis Bazley Lee, *New Jersey as a Colony and as a State*, IV (New York, 1902), 138.

GENEALOGIST'S CORNER

FRED SHELLEY

We are aware that many of the Society's members have some degree of interest in family history. With this thought in mind, it is planned to print—whether regularly or irregularly is not yet decided—a brief column in the form seen below. To be of greatest value to the greatest number of genealogists, it will be used to bring to the reader's attention certain of the sources of genealogical information available for consultation in the Society's library.

Most interested persons know that the library of the New Jersey Historical Society contains the chief collections of genealogical materials available to one and all in the state. Less well-known, even to frequent visitors, is the set of biographical cards initiated some years ago under the direction of Mrs. Joseph W. Greene, presently librarian emeritus. Most of the newspapers of Newark, Trenton, New Brunswick, and other North Jersey cities were searched and cards were typed for reports of persons who were married and persons who died. In the case of marriages, the maiden name of the woman is listed separately or cross-referenced. The number of these cards is thought to exceed 6,500. The indexing was carried through the year 1851, by which time the keeping of vital records in the counties was required. There are some additional cards for persons baptized or buried in certain churches, and other cards (the limiting date of 1851 does not apply to these) to index biographies of New Jerseyans in a variety of volumes.

The set of biographical cards has often been found useful in the past and its value should be increased as additional cards are added. The indexing of a Mount Holly newspaper for the years 1819-1827 has begun. Other South Jersey newspapers need indexing. Consideration is also being given to whether the cards on file should be put in a consolidated alphabetical sequence. Whatever changes and additions may be made, genealogists should know and use often this library tool.

ANTIQUER'S ATTIC

MARGARET E. WHITE

THE AMERICAN SCENE IN DECORATIVE ARTS

In many a home today one finds a piece of blue and white Staffordshire pottery decorated with an American scene in transfer print, or a cup and saucer of Chinese Export porcelain on which our national emblem is painted in gold. We keep these pieces because we like them, but is not their charm enhanced when we know how they came to be made?

During the first century of our American republic, people felt a strong national pride in the events marking the development of these United States. Even during the last quarter of the eighteenth century, English and French manufacturers recognized that goods decorated with American subjects found a ready sale in the colonies. Hence the production in England of such printed fabrics as "Penn's Treaty with the Indians" or "American Independence, 1776."

In the early years of the nineteenth century, American designers with an eye to the popular market made use of our national emblems, of political events, and of such contemporary scenes as Jenny Lind's visit. On wall paper, ceramics, glass, textiles, and furniture, we find these subjects of current national interest depicted. Such designs were neither naive nor ultra-refined, but were characterized by an expressive and plain-spoken style that appealed to all classes.

It is significant that even while feelings ran high between the colonies and the mother country, English textile manufacturers should have produced such designs as "American Independence," done in England in 1782, or "America presenting at the Altar of Liberty medallions of her illustrious sons." On the latter is depicted the standing figure of George Washington, after John Trumbull's portrait painted in 1780, together with medallions of our Revolutionary statesmen and officers. This textile is in the Newark Museum's collection together with a rare printed handkerchief of English origin taken from John Trumbull's painting "Declaration of Independence of the United States of America 4th July 1776," which the artist commenced in 1786. Beneath the scene are key figures and replicas of the forty-eight signatures (*see illustration*).

An English copperplate print of about 1800 shows "Penn's Treaty with the Indians" after the painting done by Benjamin West about 1771. An English Quaker and the founder of the province of Pennsylvania, William Penn was born 1644 in London. He paid his first visit to the American Colonies in 1682, landing at New Castle on the Delaware. One of the outstanding events during this visit was the treaty Penn made with a tribe of Delawares or Lenni Lenape Indians un-

der the elm tree at Shackamaxon. While documentary evidence is scarce, there seems little doubt that the treaty was made in November, 1683, under the great elm tree which was blown down in 1810. Penn gained at once and retained throughout life the deep respect of the Indians, who called him Onas, an Algonquin word meaning "feather" or "quill" by which the Indians translated the name of Penn. This pictorial fabric was used for bed and window hangings by John Penn of Philadelphia, a grandson of William Penn, and reproductions of the original fabric may still be in use.

"Penn's Treaty with the Indians" was also the subject of a transfer print used by Staffordshire potters of Fenton. Also from the English potteries came the "Apotheosis of Washington," which appears in black transfer print on a barrel-shaped pitcher made at the Herculaneum Pottery in Liverpool shortly after George Washington's death. One side of the pitcher shows Washington being lifted from the tomb, beside which are seated Liberty and America. Printed on the tomb are the words "Sacred to the memory of Washington ob. 17 Dec. A.D. 1799 Ae 68."

Shortly after the framing of the Constitution in 1787 the bald eagle became America's national emblem. The bird had appeared first in American heraldry on the flag of Washington's Life Guard. In 1789, shortly after his inauguration, President Washington made a triumphal tour of the newly united states. Along his route the eagle greeted Washington from lighted windows of public buildings and private houses, for the design of the eagle had been traced on starched or whitewashed window panes behind which shone lighted candles, a method of decoration within the means of all. At balls given in the President's honor ladies wore our national emblem painted on sashes or hair ribbons, and it was engraved on the buttons of men's coats.

Shortly thereafter the eagle made its appearance as a motif of decoration on objects of household use. Combined with the bird one finds stars for the states of the Union, the national shield, the olive branch and the bundle of arrows. Sometimes the eagle is shown holding in its beak a streamer or scroll marked with stars or our national motto E PLURIBUS UNUM. How many of us today recall the exact meaning of the olive branch and the arrows —meanings that are extremely pertinent at the present time? The branch is given pre-eminent place in the bird's right talon to signify that America prefers peace to war. The bundle of arrows represents the nation individually and collectively prepared for war, but the arrows are given a position of secondary importance by being held in the sinister or left talon. The head of the eagle is turned to its right and over it appears the Glory, denoting the presence of God and breaking through a cloud which surrounds a constellation of stars.

This emblem appears on our pass-

ports and on our one-dollar bills. It is amusing to compare the correct presentation with the decorative device sometimes found on English Staffordshire pieces or examples of Chinese Export porcelain. Foreign designers have failed to realize that each detail has significance and without compunction have painted a flower on the eagle's shield in place of the traditional bars.

Having been adopted as our national emblem, the eagle was given prominent place in all forms of arts and crafts. In furniture the bird is generally found enclosed within an oval medallion of wood inlay. In mirrors, such as the Constitution or the circular bull's eye, a wood or gilded plaster eagle surmounts the frame. From its perch the bird looks down, reminding us of the justifiable thrill of pride such decoration invoked a century and more ago.

The completion of the Erie Canal, after thirty-three years of struggle, was a subject of great rejoicing. In 1792 the New York legislature had appointed a commission to lay out a possible route for a canal connecting the Hudson River with the Great Lakes system. Thus the Erie Canal came into being. However, the War of 1812 interrupted plans and the first section of the canal was not opened to traffic until October, 1819. When in 1825 the entire route was completed, great festivities were held in Albany and New York, where water carried by canal boat from Lake Erie was poured into New York Bay. This ceremony to mark the joining of the waters was performed by Governor DeWitt Clinton. It was only after the completion of the Erie Canal that New York City began to outstrip Philadelphia, due to the fact that produce could now be shipped from the Middle West to the ocean by way of New York.

Such an important event naturally became the subject of design on wallpaper, bandboxes, and blue and white china. In the Newark Museum's collection is a bandbox covered with scenic wallpaper showing the "Grand Canal" and dated 1825. The same scene is also pictured in blue and white Staffordshire ware in the Museum's collection.

Lafayette had paid his visit to America just the year before, and the potters of England and America had been quick to use this memorable event in transfer-printed designs. The Museum's collection contains several pieces of Staffordshire pottery showing the "Landing of Gen. LaFayette at Castle Garden New York 16th August 1824" and "Lafayette at Franklin's Tomb," as well as a pitcher of Castle Garden made by the American Pottery Company in Jersey City.

When William Henry Harrison ran for President of the United States in 1840, manufacturers in both England and America capitalized on the event. Harrison entered the Army in 1791 and in January, 1800, President John Adams appointed him governor of the newly-created Indiana Territory. Harrison's victory over the Indians at the battle of Tippecanoe in Indiana established his military reputation

and was largely responsible for his subsequent election to the presidency. In 1835 Harrison was nominated and ran against Martin Van Buren, who defeated him. Four years later, Harrison was again nominated for the presidency with John Tyler as his running mate. Because he had at one time lived in or owned a log cabin at North Bend, Ohio, and because of the story that cider, not wine, was served at his table, William Harrison was derisively called by his opponents the "log cabin and hard cider" candidate. "Tippecanoe and Tyler too" became a campaign slogan, and miniature log cabins were carried in processions. Promptly the market put out cup plates and tiny cider barrels of glass. Earthenware pitchers and cups and saucers bore the likeness of William Henry Harrison in transfer print together with log cabin and national emblem (*see illustration*). President Harrison was inaugurated March 4, 1841, but died of pneumonia just one month later.

When, at the close of the Mexican War, Zachary Taylor emerged as a national hero, he and his exploits became favorite subjects for design. In wall paper, textiles, lithographs and engravings of the period, were depicted the General, his captains, and scenes from the War with Mexico, 1846-48. Zachary Taylor—"Old Rough and Ready"—first distinguished himself in the War of 1812. In 1845 President Polk ordered Taylor to march his troops into Texas, following the annexation of that state. The General's subsequent victories at Monterrey, Palo Alto, Resaca de la Palma, and Buena Vista, roused national pride. In April, 1847, great ovations were held in New York with illumination provided by thousands of candles, while the brilliance of the evening demonstration in Philadelphia could be seen from Camden, New Jersey, across the Delaware River.

Merchandise produced at the time included textiles printed in copperplate and wood block showing General Taylor at the Battle of Palo Alto, and chintz depicting in detail the Battle of Resaca de la Palma.

Needless to say, the Civil War gave our manufacturers many subjects for design. Among these was the assassination of Colonel E. E. Ellsworth. On the morning of May 24, 1861, when the Union troops crossed into Virginia, Ellsworth's Zouaves under the command of Colonel Ellsworth, then twenty-four years of age, occupied Alexandria. A Confederate flag was seen flying from the Marshall Hotel and Ellsworth with two companions went to the roof of the building, leaving a guard at the foot of the stairs. As Colonel Ellsworth descended the stairs with the flag in his hand he was assassinated by the hotel proprietor who, in turn, was killed by the guard. Colonel Ellsworth had escorted President Lincoln to Washington and the incident greatly affected Lincoln. Colonel Ellsworth lay in state in the East Room of the White House for several hours, and his death made a profound impression on the North.

This dramatic scene was portrayed on a pitcher made by Millington, Astbury and Poulson of Trenton, New Jersey.

The Battle of Gettysburg is often regarded as the turning point of the American Civil War, and Pickett's charge during the battle is one of the most famous episodes of military history. The charge of Pickett's division under the Confederate commander Lee on July 3, 1863, forms the design of a transfer-printed platter. On the rim of the dish are portrait medallions of the Confederate generals Lee and Longstreet, together with the Federal officers Hancock and Meade.

In the Museum's collection of quilts is one made from cottons printed for the hundredth anniversary of American Independence and the Centennial Exhibition at Philadelphia. Throughout the century from 1776 to 1876 America's liberties had been dearly won and deeply cherished. The Civil War had ended only ten years before. It is understandable, therefore, that the symbols of our Republic, its unity and ideals, should be given prominent place on this our hundredth anniversary.

Our national emblems are featured in all the designs. One small pattern in brown and white shows the American and Bunker Hill flags, Bunker Hill Monument being shown beneath the latter flag while a star is combined with our national flag. Incorporated in the designs are phrases written by Thomas Jefferson for the Declaration of Independence, such as "Our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor"; "All men are created equal"; "Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." Here, too, is "Sail on, O Union, strong and great!" from Longfellow's poem "Building of the Ship"—words much quoted during World War II.

There were many other scenes pictured on objects of decorative art, such as America's first international exhibition, held at New York's Crystal Palace in 1853, and the Columbian Exposition at Chicago, 1893, when electricity was the outstanding feature.

Pieces reminiscent of our political and historical past are worth preserving, both for the designs which are often quaint, and for the record they hand on to posterity of a nation's birth and development.

DIRECTOR'S DIARY

ROBERT M. LUNNY

At the time this is being written, early in August, the Society has just closed its building until after Labor Day. The 1956-1957 season came to a close two months ago with the Seventh Annual New Jersey Historical Conference on June 8. From almost the start of the past season your officers, trustees, and staff began to think about and plan the activities of the coming year. These plans are developed sufficiently so that we can give you a preview both of our program of public events and of work to be gotten under way by our staff.

In early October the season will open with a major exhibition on New Jersey transportation. You recall the opening of the exhibition on the third floor several years ago of material from the transportation collection of the Society. The public interest in that show, based primarily on the efforts and the objects deposited with the Society by the Railroadians of America, has never waned completely. Although the galleries on the third floor have been closed for some time, not a single week has since passed without our receiving telephone inquiries as to when they will be reopened.

The forthcoming show will be more inclusive. With the co-operation once again of the Railroadians, who last season gave evidence of their earnest interest by having the south gallery painted, and the enthusiastic response to requests for additional material on the part of transportation companies, it will be possible to present a broad survey of travel and transport as they developed in New Jersey. From the Indian dugout canoe to the canal boat and the trans-oceanic liner; from the stage coach to the early railroads and the latest diesel locomotives; from balloon flights to the zeppelin and the latest air transport; from the tug boats, ferries, turnpikes, trolley cars, tunnels, bridges, and the early New Jersey-built automobiles, material will illustrate the diversity of transportation in and out of this area of paramount importance to the entire nation. They will be grouped in three galleries devoted to early modes of transportation, the steamship and the railroad, and the automobile and the airplane.

How much of this is so well remembered by many of us and so completely unknown to those who are younger. We hope the New Jersey transportation show will appeal to both adults and children. Features of the exhibition, we hope, will come as a pleasant surprise and particularly appeal to school groups.

Late in October, at the annual meeting, the Society will review the past year and, after luncheon, will see the motion picture "This Is New Jersey." The film, released last winter by the New Jersey Bell Telephone Company, has enjoyed tremendous success as a handsome portrait in color of our state. To tell us about the production of the film we shall have the pleasure of hearing brief talks by John T. Cunningham, one of our trustees, who played a major part in its making, and James V. Ryan, assistant vice-president of the company, who was directly responsible for it.

As an additional feature of the annual meeting a goodly number of volumes from the library, professionally known as "discards," will be offered to our members in a book sale. These duplicates and triplicates, not required for the completion of our collection, are to be disposed of and the proceeds of their sale will be used to increase the Library and Museum Fund.

The Christmas Party in December is being planned this year especially for children. The Woman's Branch is sponsoring the afternoon party when different events should interest the youngsters and their adult escorts. These are showings in the auditorium of a film on life in the American colonies, a demonstration in the north gallery of the use of household utensils of earlier times, and the attractions of the New Jersey transportation exhibition.

After the holidays the Society will exhibit the finest of its paintings, prints, maps, documents, manuscripts, books, furniture, costumes, and decorative arts in a show that will bring together these objects for the first time in a survey of our collections. This exhibition will serve to indicate the extent of our holdings and the gaps which should be filled to round them out. The invitation opening should be a gala affair. Preparations for this exhibition have been in progress with the cleaning and restoration necessary for the usual good upkeep of paintings.

In February and March the series "The Tradition of the American Home" will be given for the third year. The general subject of the lectures will be announced at a later date. In the two previous years this spring series, sponsored by the Woman's Branch, has brought to the Society outstanding authorities on early American culture. The lectures are planned for three Saturday afternoons, two weeks apart.

The annual meeting of the Woman's Branch will be held in April or early May when all members of the Society are invited to hear a guest speaker. Notices will be sent in advance when plans are completed.

The final event of the season will be the Eighth Annual New Jersey Historical Conference held in June in conjunction with the Bergen County Historical Society on the Teaneck campus of Fairleigh Dickinson University. The Bergen County group is getting an early start in program-planning. It is hoped that the Museums Council

of New Jersey will participate for the first time.

These are the activities which are definitely included in the 1957-1958 program. Others may be added. But these meetings, exhibitions and lectures constitute only a part of the work of the Society for the year. Some of the others may be mentioned.

We are assured of the means of employing a library assistant for the season who will work primarily on a review of the newspaper files and the Vroom papers. *The Guide to the Manuscript Collections* will be seen through the press by the author, who is our librarian, and the editor of the PROCEEDINGS. A review of all membership records will be completed by the staff secretary to assure an accurate count for record, mailing, and dues purposes.

For several months we are employing a museum assistant to work especially with the assistant to the director on hanging the two principal exhibitions in October and in January. He will also aid at the start of a long needed inventory of museum holdings, a project on which the Woman's Branch has offered very willingly to help. It is a most worthwhile task that should be done to determine in detail the constitution of our collections.

No more important piece of work is the last one to be mentioned. In the autumn the Society will formally enter the field to propose and execute a plan, with other institutions involved, to further the teaching of New Jersey history in schools, public and independent, throughout the state. A series of pamphlets has been started by the librarian and the director as a contribution to the general body of material available for use at the fourth-grade level. A small preliminary meeting called for September will be followed shortly thereafter by a general session at the Society which all those interested may attend. Constant inquiries received by the president indicate an acute need for materials and advice. The Society can do no less than take a major part in these deliberations and the work indicated by them.

WORKS IN PROGRESS

Rev. Edwin S. Ford, Ford Hill Road, Whippany, New Jersey, is interested in obtaining any information that may be known to members of the Society and other readers of the PROCEEDINGS concerning the "Morris Rangers," a military organization which flourished from about the year 1812 until sometime after 1828.

OF BOOKS AND THINGS

In this department are combined short articles based on holdings of the Society's library, and listings of new publications about New Jersey. The contributors, Mr. Shelley and Miss Studley are, respectively, librarian of the New Jersey Historical Society and principal New Jersey librarian of the Newark Public Library.

FROM THE LIBRARY

FRED SHELLEY

Few are the records that reveal the lives of New Jersey women beyond the barest vital statistics — Bible records, marriage certificates, legal documents, death notices. Often those looking at a manikin in a fine old dress and accessories must wonder what the owner was really like and what she might say if she could speak to us. A small group of manuscripts, the Stafford MSS, in the library gives us an insight into the life of one woman, Hannah Ward, of Newark, and her circle of relatives and associates.[1]

Hannah must have been a vivacious girl to judge by her early letters. She had a pleasant, rather sprightly style of writing and a feeling for the English language, well used, that was not shared by all her contemporaries. She wrote in a beautiful hand, but the elegance vanished in the busy days of her maturity when the children were under foot and household cares were many. She was quite religious and much concerned about the state of religion in her own mind and in the community. She shared with her contemporaries a dislike of having her letters read by strangers; perhaps at the distance of a century and more she will not mind this intrusion into her private affairs.

The Ward family was not an ordinary one. Her father, Thomas Ward (*ca.* 1759-1842), practiced law in Newark, his native city, had been an officer at the time of the Whiskey Rebellion, and was an Essex County judge by the time the correspondence opens.[2] Soon after, he was elected to Congress for two terms (1813-17). In 1824 he was one of the committee to receive and entertain General Lafayette when that worthy visited Newark. Colonel Ward survived his daughter by six years and was the senior officer in the New Jersey Cavalry when he died. His household contained a numerous brood of children of whom Hannah, born June 25, 1791, was the sixth child. One brother, Isaac, was two years younger, and another, Thomas, the noted poet, play-

[1]Manuscript group 286.

[2]*Biographical Directory of the American Congress* (Washington, 1927), p. 1667.

wright, and musician, was born in 1807.[3] A sister to whom Hannah often wrote was Jane, her junior by six years. (A loose sheet in the Stafford MSS lists the other children.)

The first letter[4] is one written by Hannah Ward to her brother Isaac, then a student at the College of New Jersey.[5] In a most deprecating way she began. " 'Where a woman talks but little,' say the cynics, 'that little is more than half nonsense' — But when she talks abundantly, how much patience is requisite for her attentive auditor, to preserve his good nature, and his politeness from being cast away, by these head winds and little squalls." Continuing she wrote that quiet had come over the household as she "scribbled." "This dearth of argument, and wonderful oeconomy of words, has tended greatly to compose my intellectual system, and call home each Errant thought, which in turbulent times are very apt to stay at large . . . Not half an hour ago, when Mother Gab held the sceptre, faction was on the wing . . . but now Mother Gab being quite tired out, and much indisposed . . ." peace reigned.

When Thomas Ward went to Washington for the first session of Congress in 1813, his daughter wrote saying the family was relieved to know of his safe arrival.[6] The Congressman's horses gave the family special concern. "They who happened to see them cut capers in Broad Street, exaggerated the matter, and, out of pure friendship, and regard for our feelings, came to tell us that notwithstanding your skill in driving you never would arrive safe at Washington with those fractious horses." She reported that "the house, and family, continue in the same state as when you left us; the one has not taken fire, nor has the other deviated at all from its accustomed regularity. Six O'clock is the hour for rising, seven, for breakfast, and at one, we never fail to sit down to dinner. Politics, still continue to be the most interesting topic, and which we discourse upon with as great fluency, and as little judgement as ever: And still place implicit confidence in whatever the Newspapers tell us every evening." All the family live in peace and harmony except "Thomas and his Mama, who often enter into an argument upon the Advantages and disadvantages of going to School. Thomas, just about school time, maintains a very different opinion from that of his Mother; which she endeavours to change, by every forcible argument she can

[3]Thomas Ward (1807-1873) wrote *Passaic, a Group of Poems Touching That River: with Other Musings* (1842) and a poem delivered at the bi-centennial of the founding of Newark. The latter was printed in the *Collections* of this society, VI, Supplement (1866), 59-74. See also *Dictionary of American Biography,* XIX, 440-41.

[4]June 6, 1811.

[5]Isaac Ward (d. 1852), was a member of the Class of 1811 at Princeton and received his A.M. in 1816.

[6]May 27, 1813.

command: but, though a broad slice of bread and butter, and a ginger bread, are often added to the rest of her persuasions, they very seldom make the desired impression upon him . . ."

In her next she told her father that Tom "passes his time in the most disengaged manner possible —free from all literary shackles, he refuses all instruction and is determined upon being a self-taught genius."[7] And in a postscript, "Mama understands that feather fans are as cheap as dirt in Washington and Philadelphia & hopes you will feel inclined to make purchase of a few as you come along." Whether the Congressman obliged is not revealed in the letters.

Hannah was nearly twenty-eight when she married the Rev. Ward Stafford, of New York.[8] A single, undated letter of their courtship survives; in it she apologizes for not having written sooner as she has burned two fingers. The Rev. Mr. Stafford was a Presbyterian clergyman who felt called to do considerable missionary work in New York State and in the West. A folder of recommendations for his work contains, among others, statements of DeWitt Clinton, Archibald Alexander of the Princeton Theological Seminary faculty, and Theodore Frelinghuysen. The last follows:

> The Revd. Ward Stafford, now of Newark New Jersey, & formerly of the City of New York being about to prosecute a journey thro the western parts of the State of New York & into the States of Ohio & Kentucky, it affords me great pleasure to commend him to the kind offices of christian friends—His personal worth—& his exemplary deportment, as a minister of Christ, for a number of years, that I have enjoyed the pleasure of an acquaintance, entitle him to the esteem & confidence of the christian public—
>
> Theo. Frelinghuysen
> Newark. June 13, 1829.

The minister was often away from home, and Hannah worried about him. Once she wrote, "I am happy to find you so successful in your undertakings, and hope your health will not fail you, as I fear it will if you do not allow yourself more time for recreation—You will no doubt assent to the reasonableness of my being careful of you when you consider that good husbands are not to be found every day, and though the most precious, are the scarcest articles in housekeeping."[9] Of their young son, she added, "We jolt about frequently in the farm waggon, which with the pure air of the country has given Henry a pair of red cheeks."

"It is now the 4th of July," she wrote in 1829, "great preparations

[7]July 13, 1813.
[8]*Centinel of Freedom* (Newark), March 30, 1819.
[9]August 22, 1820.

have been made for the celebration of it—We have had a very wet morning . . . There is to be an Oration delivered by Mr. Amzi Dod and a Collection taken up for the Colonization Society."[10]

Correspondence in this family, as in all families, increases when one or another member is away from home and vanishes when conversation will serve. In 1829 or 1830 the Rev. Mr. Stafford and his family moved to Ohio where he took charge of a church at Youngstown. There were now five children, and three more came in the next six years. Hannah wrote to her kinswoman, Eliza Harper, that a lady there complimented her on her youthful appearance.[11] "I could not let this compliment to my looks pass by, without telling you of it, for as Papa says, Women love to hear that they look young —One reason why the women look older here, is, that they are so much in the habit of doing their own work, and their skin gets burnt with the fire and the sun." By this time, Hannah thought, "you are [back] in Newark [from New York] where a letter will find you, where you are enjoying the comforts of summer; exchanged *city perfumery,* and the noise of rattling carts, for fragrant airs, and singing birds;—and where I should like to join you for a little season, but would return again, for methinks your fields are not so green, your trees so rich, neither do your birds understand music so well." Often, afterward, she complained of the bitterly cold winds and winters they experienced. In closing she added, "Tell Jane I shall thank her to procure for me a green gauze veil, one of Mr. Sandford's best fine tooth combs, and a little brush to clean it with, two or three good corset laces, one of those pliable steel corset bones, such as I procured once in the bowery—a small parcel of best quills, made into pens by Cousin Hay . . . also if they can be found the Religious Magazine that Mr. Frelinghuysen borrowed . . ."

Soon the children were old enough to write to their grandfather and their aunts. In 1835 young Mary Stafford wrote to Aunt Jane to report her safe arrival in Ohio: "When we arrived at Elizabethtown Point we took the steamboat to Amboy then the railroad to Trenton. We then took the steamboat again and arrived at Philadelphia about 3 oclock in the afternoon. We found it a very beautiful city."[12]

Toward the end of November, 1836, Hannah hastened to write to Jane, she said, while the mail might still get through.[13] Household cares were pressing. She had

[10]July 4, 1829.

[11]June 16, 1830. In another letter to Eliza Harper dated October 18, 1832, Hannah Stafford said since Colonel Rain, the postmaster, "who is a Jackson man looks very cross, having failed of being elected to Congress by a majority of thirteen hundred for Mr. Whittelsey, many of our citizens are afraid to trust letters there."

[12]August 13, 1835.

[13]November 24, 1836.

had no girl to help in the kitchen for a long time but now had one for the winter. The Rev. Mr. Stafford had a new class in Latin, and Mary and Julia were undertaking the study of the language.

Hannah Ward Stafford died, apparently following the birth of her eighth child who lived for one day, on December 13, 1836, in the cold Ohio winter. The touching letters the Reverend Stafford wrote to Hannah's father are among the last letters found.[14] He told of his plan for the children's education and his intention to break up housekeeping and visit Hudson, N.Y. The final letter is written to Mrs. Mary B. Stafford in the care of the Rev. Ward Stafford at Hudson in 1841.[15] After nearly five years the Rev. Mr. Stafford had married a second time.

Two additional documents deserve comment: The one a manuscript religious essay in Hannah's hand written in the form of a prospectus for a play based on the coming of the Lord at the end of the world; the second an oval booklet, pocket-size, also in Hannah's hand with quotations from the Bible for solace and comfort on different occasions.

Here the papers end. Though we might, by the use of other sources, fill in further detail or complete the genealogy, we must, for now, be content with these peeks at the lives of some New Jersey men, women, and children.

NEW JERSEY IN PRINT

MIRIAM V. STUDLEY

REVIEWS

Few books have been as quick to arouse interest as Arthur Pierce's *Iron in the Pines* which came off the press at the time our society was meeting in New Brunswick in June. James M. Ransom of Westwood, who reviews it, is himself an enthusiastic student of the old iron industry in New Jersey. He is, unbeknown to Mr. Pierce, the owner of the original document signed by the Royal Governor William Franklin in 1769, granting certain special privileges to owners of iron works in New Jersey. Mr. Pierce refers to his act on page 163 of *Iron in the Pines.* At the June conference of our society in New Brunswick, Mr. Ransom was one of the panel members in the workshop on "Collecting Jerseyana."

The busiest people, are, we find, often the most ready to help when asked to contribute of their time and thought to this society. We appreciate Dr. John E. Bebout's

[14]December 14, 16, 1836.
[15]October 20, 1841.

taking time to review for us the *Government of New Jersey* by Bennett Rich.

Dr. Bebout, a resident of Cedar Grove, is assistant director of the National Municipal League, now on leave to serve as associate director of the Temporary State Commission on the Constitutional Convention of the State of New York. Dr. Bebout has been professor of government at Dana College, Newark; executive assistant to Governor Edison; and a spokesman for the Committee on Constitution Revision at the New Jersey Constitution Convention in 1947. He is the author of *Documents and Readings in New Jersey Government* and one of the editors of the *Proceedings* of the 1844 State Constitutional Convention.

Mr. Flynn, who reviews *Revolution in America,* is a member of the Fairleigh Dickinson University faculty, and he teaches a course in New Jersey history. He is a resident of Little Falls.

Iron in the Pines: the Story of New Jersey's Ghost Towns and Bog Iron. By Arthur D. Pierce. (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1957. 244 pages. Price $5.00.)

There will be a lot more traffic on some of the seldom-used roads in the Pine Barren area of southern New Jersey after people have finished reading this book, which gives the colorful history of the old iron furnaces, forges and ghost towns of this intriguing section.

Many years ago, iron works were scattered all over New Jersey and travelers could not go very far without passing several of them. Today, however, there are only a few ruins remaining of what was once one of the state's most prosperous industries and of great help to us during the Revolutionary War. Usually very little is known of the stories behind these relics of the past, but Mr. Pierce has through painstaking research uncovered many new and interesting facts so that he can present to his readers a very full account of the fascinating history of those in his area.

I enjoyed greatly his chapter on "The Furnaces in the Forest" explaining in a most readable style how the iron works were built and the way they were worked. In this same chapter is a listing of thirty old furnaces of southern New Jersey, together with the names of the builders, the year opened and the year closed. The chapters on the Etna, Atsion, Martha, and Batsto furnaces, the mystery and ruins of the old community at Harrisville, as well as the one on Charles Read who set out to become the greatest ironmaster in New Jersey and what he achieved, all proved very interesting reading.

Back in 1931, Charles S. Boyer published his *Early Forges and Furnaces of New Jersey,* now a collector's item bringing twenty to twenty-five dollars in the second-hand book market. Since this book was published, many have hoped for a companion volume, which

would go into more detail on some of the old iron works. Now, twenty-six years later, Mr. Pierce has accomplished this on his particular section of the state, with *Iron in the Pines,* a book deserving of a place on your bookshelf.—James M. Ransom.

The Government and Administration of New Jersey. By Bennett M. Rich. ("American Commonwealths Series," W. Brooke Graves, Editor: Vol. 28.) New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1957. xiv+415 pages. Price $7.50.

This is both a book to be read and a book to be kept handy for ready reference to an amazing amount of factual information about government in New Jersey. It is also a book to be pondered by anyone interested in the future of the state of New Jersey or the efficiency of our federal system. It is, in short, a persuasive demonstration of the validity of the conception of the *American Commonwealths Series,* of which it is the tenth volume to have appeared in print. American government is too complicated and in the fifty-odd separate states and territories displays too much variety and grass roots vitality to be adequately described even for the general reader in the traditional one- or two-volume texts.

The only serious fault that this reader finds with Professor Rich's pioneer work on New Jersey government is that it is too short. Four hundred pages are not enough to tell what any alert citizen ought to be told about the government of his state. Except in the crucial matter of the cost of publication, brevity can be a very doubtful virtue. A book by the same author that was half again as long would, I am confident, have been more readable and interesting as well as more informative and thought-provoking. One of the reasons why state and local government as commonly presented often seems dull is that it is dealt with in too compact a form. Thus the elements of history, of drama, of the interplay of human, environmental, and institutional factors that constitute the dynamics of government, are squeezed so dry that the taste to the reader is likely to be more that of a mouthful of sawdust than a juicy Jersey apple. Happily, Professor Rich, though obviously hampered by space limitations, has managed to liven his facts with the flavor of wit and the juice of human understanding. Anybody with a rustic New Jersey background will be reassured by the observation that this book is more like a Baldwin than a Ben Davis.

The Government and Administration of New Jersey is a fitting present to the people of the state on the occasion of the tenth birthday of their new constitution. It views the constitutional revision movement in perspective and reports authoritatively on its more enduring consequences for the government and politics of the state. This gives the book more

permanent value within the state than one written fifteen years ago would have had and greater significance to people in other states who look with some envy at the most significant state constitutional revision of this century. Professor Rich had a ring-side seat at the Constitutional Convention in 1947 and through his writings and his work as founder and director of the Bureau of Government Research at Rutgers University has been instrumental in some of the work of implementing the new constitution and explaining it to the people.

With respect to these as well as other matters, Professor Rich has been careful to check his own judgments with those of persons particularly knowledgeable in each subject area. Consequently his judgments regarding current operations, future trends, and problems needing official and public attention carry substantial weight. He is properly emphatic about progress made in such areas as administrative reorganization, judicial administration, legislative procedures, municipal government and equal rights, at the same time pointing to much unfinished business and to important problems yet unresolved.

One of the values in the study of particular state governments lies in the identification and examination of areas of experience that may be helpful to other states. As already indicated, this book deals with many aspects of the revision and implementation of the New Jersey constitution that are of nation-wide interest. Readers in different states will identify many other subjects of special interest to them. Some may get ideas from New Jersey's modern state department of defense, with its early integration of civil defense and disaster control. Others may be interested in New Jersey's system of law enforcement, which is more highly centralized than that of most states. Still others may learn much from a study of New Jersey's unusually rich experience with intergovernmental relations, stemming from what Woodrow Wilson once called her "singular position in the sisterhood of states." It is to be hoped that many, both in and out of the state, will be moved to look with increased wonder, not to say horror, at New Jersey's antediluvian revenue system, to mention one subject on which the state persists in setting a bad example.

Within the severe space limitations imposed upon him, Professor Rich has given the discerning reader the basis for a preliminary check-up on the quality and adequacy of a considerable number of vital state services and activities, including institutional and health services, water supply and other resource and conservation fuctions, state and local planning, and higher education.

Chapter 27, "A Look Ahead," partly because it is conservative in tone, is a striking effective summary of some of the emerging problems and unmet needs with

which the state must come to grips during the next few years. This chapter, which is amply documented in all that goes before, should be mandatory reading for party platform makers, candidates for state and local office, persons responsible for the agenda of civic and other voluntary organizations and every citizen who cares about the welfare of the state and the future of his country.—John E. Bebout.

The Roads of Home, Lanes and Legends of New Jersey. By Henry Charlton Beck. (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1956. xii, 289 pages.)

To his several popular earlier volumes Father Beck has now added another title. In this latest book he roams the length and breadth of the state seeking from its tiny hamlets, overgrown ruins or a sleeping churchyard a story from its past. In his twenty-four chapters he tells us many tales of earlier days, some of whose plots have been written many times before. But some have been lost from general knowledge; the facts became drier with each year as they lay between the yellowing pages of too-little-known historical journals and publications.

Much of each of these stories, if not legends, is factual but to most of them are added conversations between the author and those he sought out to talk to on the spot. These chats, while giving flavor to the account, do tend at times to detract from the thread of the plot or the main theme. What are intended as illuminations occasionally become mere deviations. This interspersing of history or stories with folksay does give these little tales a leisurely and often delightful quality that characterizes much of the author's style. Father Beck's books are always welcome to those who know New Jersey and its past.—Robert M. Lunny.

Gateway of Progress, 1857-1957; the Story of New Jersey's Largest Savings Bank through its First Century of Service. Edited and Produced by Muir and Company. (Newark, N.J.: The Howard Savings Institution, 1957. 56 pages.)

The modern company history is a happy blend of official record and local history, frequently in attractive dress. This history of the Howard Savings Institution relates the history of the bank to the history of Newark and the lives of its officers. Pencil sketches based on old photographs lend unity to the book's design, in keeping with the lightness of the type and the wide margins, making a pleasing and attractive volume.

A popular and readable treatment, this history is marred by a few errors of fact, some unfortunately perpetuated by well-known sources. The Federal Writers' *Guide* to New Jersey is responsible for the mistaken statement that Trinity Church, burned, all but the steeple, in 1804. Actually the original church, except for its tower was torn down and rebuilt in 1809.

A real boner is the "Log huts" which were never built on the home lots of Newark, that method of building being foreign to New Englanders. Hastily constructed wigwams or bark shelters were the first homes, followed soon by "better houses" of rough hewn planks set on end like palisades. Later, clapboard or shingle was the usual siding for homes in the Newark area.

Continuing, as there is no proof that the Reverend Abraham Pierson, Sr., was ordained at Newark-on-Trent, some historians are of the opinion that the name of our city is derived from New Worke, a fitting name for a settlement in the wilderness. To set the matter straight, the slender thread of evidence is in the *Century Sermon* of the Reverend Alexander MacWhorter, who gently remarked "I possess no documents or written materials—except what have been taken from the relations of old people to me in former time. Therefore it must not be expected that they will be very accurate; nor will I vouch for the perfect truth of all that may be said. But I will deliver nothing but what wears the appearance of truth. Those which are facts, shall be faithfully stated as such; those which are only probable, shall be so represented." All that the Reverend Mr. MacWhorter said of the name Newark was this: "The first minister was Mr. Pierson. It is said that he was espiscopally ordained in the town or neighborhood of Newark in South Britain, which perhaps might have originally suggested the name of this town."

There is likewise no proof that Newark's Military Park was the scene of the writing of "The Crisis," though Paine's masterpiece was begun in Newark. Someone will surely object that old "Cranetown" is now Montclair as well as part of Bloomfield, and Newark's town meeting government lasted way past 1713 when the Queen Anne Charter was granted. In the paragraphs on industries no mention at all is made of cider-making, for which Newark was famous as early as 1682, when Governor Carteret wrote to England that Newark produced more cider than New England, Rhode Island, or Long Island. Coming down to more recent times, there is no record that Thomas A. Edison was ever a telegraph operator at Newark's Four Corners, though he had a factory two blocks away at Mechanic Street from 1872 to 1876. These are all small errors to be sure, but ones which could easily have been corrected. They are unfortunate flaws in a volume which is an attractive piece of bookmaking and a most readable company history. Would that all writers of local history might emulate the candor of our saintly Doctor MacWhorter. —MVS.

Revolution in America: Confidential Letters and Journals, 1776-1784, of Adjutant General Major Baumeister of the Hessian Forces. Translated and Annotated by Bernhard A. Uhlendorf. (New

Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1957. xiv, 640 pages.)

"Right Honorable Lord, Gracious High and Mighty Colonel"—so begins the account of a Hessian adjutant general serving with the troops of Hesse-Cassel during the American Revolution. This account was to be far more extended than the author—or any of his colleagues, for that matter—ever expected. The first report was written from Brooklyn on September 2, 1776, but the last report was not written until April 23, 1784, at Bremerlehe (Germany), when the troops of Hesse-Cassel were once again almost home.

The letters and journals of Adjutant General Major Carl Baurmeister were written to his superior, Baron von Jungkenn, Lord High Chamberlain and Minister of State. The papers first came to light in 1929 as a result of a search for unknown collections of family papers in Westphalia. In 1932 the papers were inventoried and evaluated in terms of the American Revolution by Bernhard A. Uhlendorf. Mr. Uhlendorf prepared the translation and annotation from this collection.

Here is the American Revolution, almost in its entirety, from the viewpoint of a professional soldier employed as a mercenary to subdue rebellious and disloyal subjects of another king, a king to whom the mercenaries had now sworn allegiance. Patriotic feelings for either side were not involved. The Hessians were not concerned with the causes of the Revolution and fought simply as well-trained, well-disciplined soldiers temporarily in the service of a new ruler.

The reports not only present a broader view than most of this nature, probably due mostly to Baumeister's position as First Adjutant General to the commander of the Hesse-Cassel troops and sometime aide to General Clinton, but they present an almost continuous account of the 1776-1784 period. In addition the reports go beyond a simple accounting of military events and include events of social and economic importance as well. The sectional rivalries of the Americans, the British conduct of the war, the American suspicions of the French, the dominance of Washington, the weakness of Congress, the business-as-usual attitude of merchants on both sides, his distrust of the "rebels' " promises, the hardships of the people, all are among the many topics which he reports to his superior.

Carl Baumeister, Adjutant General with the forces of Hesse-Cassel, in his desire to keep Baron von Jungkenn informed has done much to provide a relatively unbiased view of America's War for Independence.—Walter H. Flynn, Jr.

South after Gettysburg: Letters of Cornelia Hancock, 1863-1868. Edited by Henrietta Stratton Jacquette. (New York: Crowell, 1937, 1956. 288 pages.)

Cornelia Hancock, of Hancock's Bridge, was just twenty-three when her brother-in-law, a doctor, asked her to come as a nurse to Gettys-

burg. Rejected by Dorothea Dix because of her youth and rosy cheeks, she went nonetheless. Her letters now grouped under Part I ("Civil War Nurse") were first published in 1937. The finding of another group of letters since then made possible the publication of this readable volume with an appreciative foreword by Bruce Catton. Part II ("Schoolteacher in the South, 1866-1868") relates her experiences conducting schools for the freedmen. Cornelia Hancock was a spirited Quaker girl, warmhearted, resourceful. Her vivid letters present the reality of war and its aftermath as no formal history can do. To anyone interested in the human side of American history, I can enthusiastically recommend this book.—MVS.

Huguenot Ancestors Represented in the Membership of the Huguenot Society of New Jersey. Second Edition. Compiled by Sara Morton Koehler. (Bloomfield, N.J.: Huguenot Society of New Jersey, 1956. 74 pages. Price $2.00. Order from Albert F. Koehler, Treasurer, 26 Berkeley Hts. Park, Bloomfield.)

The names of about two hundred Huguenot settlers in America are listed in this membership list of their descendants. The places in Europe from which they emigrated, and the place and date of settlement in America are given. While information on a few of the settlers is fragmentary, brief biographical data are provided for many. Authority is given for most statements, and source books are listed. One will find here the family names of many persons prominent in the colonial and later history of New Jersey.—MVS.

Cottagers and Commuters. A History of Pitman, New Jersey. By Harold F. Wilson. (Pitman, 1955. xvii, 231 pages.)

Professor Wilson, of Glassboro State Teachers College, has come close to the ideal in local history writing in the history of Pitman. He has drawn on the resources of the community, through the Pitman History Committee, and several chapters and appendices are contributed by local experts. The work as a whole, however, shows Mr. Wilson's guiding and organizing hand.

The story of the community from its origin as a camp meeting site for the Methodists in 1871 to the modern town of the twentieth century is traced without exaggerated claims but with quiet pride. The occasion for this history was the fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the borough of Pitman in 1905.

It is to be regretted that this fine history is marred by illustrations that do not match the text. Although there are limitations on what can be done with "record photographs," the printer might have done a better job.

Annual Report of the Commissioner of Conservation and Economic Development, 1955-56. (Trenton: Department of

Conservation and Economic Development, 1957. 125 pages.)

Did you know that the New Jersey State Development Plan (1951) was the first blueprint of its kind prepared by any state? Do you know that New Jersey now ranks fourth in the United States in per-capita income? Do you know that in surveying the Wharton Tract, the state Bureau of Forestry, Parks and Historic Sites has located and plotted on maps 2085 deed descriptions? Do you know that this reservation, containing ninety thousand acres and two historic iron-mining villages, is larger than the whole of Essex County? These and many other facts about New Jersey's commerce, industry, navigation, water supply, aviation, housing, parks, recreation and historic sites are to be found in this unusually informative and forward-looking annual report.—MVS.

The New Jersey Family Index, Third Edition, 1957-58: *Old N.J. Families and their Genealogists.* (Short Hills, N.J.: *The New Jersey Genesis,* 1957. 12 pages. Price $2.00; $1.00 to subscribers to the *New Jersey Genesis.*)

Published in the same format as the quarterly magazine for genealogists issued by Harold A. Sonn of Short Hills, this index and directory will appear every other year. The third edition contains about 1800 New Jersey surnames and the names of several hundred persons working on New Jersey family history. A card file in Mr. Sonn's home (49 Grosvenor Road, Short Hills) lists other genealogists whose names appeared in the first and second editions of the *Family Index* which were published in 1955 and 1956. The *Family Index* is useful to libraries specializing in genealogy, and even more useful to those whose collections are weak in that field, for it is the means of helping the person who does not know where to turn for information. So many families in the mid-west, far-west and even in the Maritime Provinces of Canada have their roots in New Jersey that a service such as Mr. Sonn provides is of wide importance.—MVS.

Report of Law Revision and Legislative Services, 1955-56. By New Jersey Commissioner on Law Revision and Legislative Services. (Trenton: State Library, 1957. 56 pages.)

This document is basic for an understanding of the workings of the Division of Legislative Information and Research in the Law Revision and Legislative Services Agency created by the New Jersey legislature. Other divisions of the agency are engaged as "Counsel to the Legislature" and in "Law Revision and Bill Drafting." The Division of Legislative Information and Research is headed by Dr. William S. Carpenter, former head of the Civil Service Commission and professor of politics at Princeton. While the primary purpose of this division is direct service to the legislature, it and the report on its work are vital to us, since the public now has a central office from which to obtain

information on legislation passed, or pending, at all times.

An intensely interesting feature of this report is its account of the use of sound recording and transcribing equipment especially in important and long-drawn-out hearings such as those on juvenile delinquency, wire tapping, water supply, and middle income housing. These transcripts are processed and available to libraries and other agencies through the State Library.

A feature to be commended is the fine working co-operation between the Legislative Information and Research Division and the Bureau of Law and Legislative Reference in the State Library.—MVS.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

The sudden death of Chief Justice Vanderbilt, the appointment of Judge Weintraub as his successor, with the other judicial appointments that followed, have focused attention on New Jersey's court system, which, since 1947 has been changed from one of the most antiquated to one of the most modern in the United States. For this reason we welcome a seven-page mimeographed *Bibliography of Articles on New Jersey Courts,* dated July 1, 1957, and distributed free by the Bureau of Public and School Library Services in the State Department of Education. While many of the articles are from legal periodicals to be found only in law libraries and lawyers' offices, the list includes also articles from magazines to be found in public libraries such as *Saturday Evening Post, National Municipal Review, State Government,* and *Time.* Many of the articles are from the *Rutgers University Law Review.*

Annual Report to the Governors and Legislatures of the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania by the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission. (Morrisville, Pa.: The Commission, 1957. 27 pages.) A record of economies effected, and repairs and replacements necessitated by the flood of August 1955.

The Blauvelt Familly Genealogy. By Louis Blauvelt. (East Orange: Association of Blauvelt Descendants, 1957. 1100 pages.)

Descendants of Samuel Hills; a Supplement to The Hills Family in America, W. S. Hills and Thomas Hills. By Winifred L. Holman. (Rahway? 1957. 97 pages.)

Early Arts of New Jersey: The Potter's Art, c. 1680-1900, an Exhibition at the New Jersey State Museum. (Trenton, N.J.: State Museum, 1956. 56 pages.) Annotated catalog of 376 items, including historic information quoted from notes of the late Robert J. Sim, adviser on the colonial, stoneware, and redware sections.

Employment Practices in Hunterdon, Sussex and Warren Counties, N.J. (Newark, N.J.: Division against Discrimination, 1957. 19 pages.)

History of Perth Amboy, New Jersey, Young Men's Christian Association, 1912-1957. By William

C. McGinnis (Perth Amboy, 1957. 164 pages.)

History of the First Presbyterian Church, Hightstown, New Jersey 1857-1957. By Alphaeus H. and Lillian S. Albert, assisted by Ann Ruth Taylor. (Hightstown: The Church, 1957. 144 pages.)

The Key to Better Housing, the Field Inspector, 12th Annual Report. By Charles G. Yerzak. (Trenton: N.J. Bureau of Migrant Labor, 1956.)

Legal Research Guide for the New Jersey State Library. (Trenton, N.J.: Bureau of Law and Legislative Reference, Division of State Library, Archives and History, 1957. 31 pages.) Planned for lawyers, but helpful also to libraries and historians in their use of legislative journals, bills, resolutions, and law compilations.

Mr. Justice. Edited by Allison Dunham and Philip B. Kurland. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. xi, 241 pages.) Contains on pages 69-95 a biographical sketch of Joseph P. Bradley, of New Jersey, associate justice of the Supreme Court, 1870-92, by Charles Fairman, whose biography of the justice is in progress.

The Rush Family of Northwest New Jersey. Compiled by Pearl R. Cressman and Kaye N. Cressman. (Washington, N.J., 1925. 39 pages.)

Seventeenth Public Hearing before New Jersey Youth Study Commission; Subject: Recruitment and Training for Work with Youth. (Trenton, N.J.: Youth Study Commission, 1957. 177 pages.)

Small Town Merchant. By Samuel E. Burr, Jr. (New York: Vantage Press, 1957. 354 pages.) A biography of the author's father, Samuel E. Burr, and a study of small-town life in Bordentown from the Civil War to World War I.

Wanted: a Water Supply Program for New Jersey. (Newark, N.J.: State Chamber of Commerce, 1957. 18 pages.) Condensation of the 1955 "Tippets-Abbett-McCarthy-Stratton" survey, reviewed in the April 1956 Proceedings.

Wolf Creek Flood Control, Borough of Ridgefield, Bergen County, New Jersey. By Robert E. Cyphers, Jr. (Trenton: Division of Water Policy and Supply, 1957. 22 pages.) Points up serious conservation problems arising out of rapid urbanization through real estate and industrial development.

PERIODICALS

Persons outside the North Jersey metropolitan area may not have seen the series of articles on New Jersey's craftsmen and cabinet makers in the Newark *Sunday News.* It began June 2, 1957, and is by Walter Van Hoesen, former president of the New Jersey Society, Sons of the American Revolution and currently editor of *De Halve Maen,* historical quarterly of the Holland Society of New York.

It is good that Mr. Van Hoesen is focusing the attention of a wide group of readers on this subject, on which information is hard to find and often lacking in documentation.

The *Information Bulletin* of the Library of Congress, September 3, 1957, brings news of a project involving Dr. Nelson Burr, author of *The Anglican Church in New Jersey,* reviewed in the January 1955 PROCEEDINGS. Dr. Burr, who is research assistant in the Library of Congress Exhibits Office, is on leave to June 30, 1957, to prepare a bibliography of the history of religion in the United States, as a part of Princeton University's "Special Studies in American Civilization."

Persons doing research in the history of New Jersey families which moved to Indiana will wish to note an article in the *Indiana Magazine of History,* June 1957, on county records in the Genealogy Division of the Indiana State Library. This gives in tabular form with dates the various types of vital records in each Indiana county, with date of founding of each county.

The magazine *Manuscripts,* Winter 1957 (p. 53), mentions the fact that the New-York Historical Society has acquired "eleven manuscripts including letters of Captain Andrew Brown, Captain Adam Huyler, Colonel Elijah Hand, Robert Hude, and others describing their whaleboat warfare against the British off the New Jersey coast, January to June 1782."

Manuscripts, Fall 1956 and Winter 1957, reports the acquisition of Walt Whitman manuscripts by the University of Virginia and of Whitman memorabilia by the Brooklyn Public Library.

History

"This Amazing America as Pictured on Old Blue China," by Arthur H. Merritt, in *New-York Historical Society Quarterly,* April 1957, pp. 143-75. Includes two New Jersey views.

"Barnegat Lighthouse: New Jersey's Most Compelling Symbol," by John T. Cunningham, in *New Jersey Business,* July 1957, pp. 13, 14.

"Bloomfield College Confronts a Challenge," by Frederick Schweitzer, in *Daughters of the American Revolution Magazine,* June 1957, pp. 725-28. History and philosophy of Bloomfield College and Seminary (Presbytery of Newark), Bloomfield, N.J.

"The Burials at Stowe Point, Salem County," by Paul H. Sargent, in Archeological Society of New Jersey, *Bulletin* Number 12, November 1956, pp. 23, 24.

"The City Built by a Church . . . Ocean City," by Edward B. Bowker, in *New Jersey County Government,* June 1957, pp. 11, 20.

"Dover—a Warmly Human Town with a Backbone of Iron and a Heart of Industrial Progress," in *New Jersey Bell,* June 1957, pp. 10-14.

"The First Twenty-Five Years of

the Archeological Society of New Jersey," by Ethel Boissevain, in Archeological Society of New Jersey, *Bulletin* Number 12, November 1956, pp. 1-7.

"The Garden Then—and Now, 1857-1926," by Robert Riggs Kerr, in *The Museum,* Spring 1957, pp. 1-13. Newark Museum, on the site of Governor Marcus Ward's mansion.

"Glimpses of Local History No. 14: the Whipping Tree," in *Relics,* April-May 1957, p. 9, At Squide Post's Tavern, Montvale.

"The Historic Delaware River," by Edna M. Hornberger, in *Daughters of the American Revolution Magazine,* July 1957, pp. 851-53.

"Jersey Central Lines—the Railroad That Started with a Ferryboat," in *Via Port of New York,* June 1957, pp. 18, 19.

"Local Folklore," in *Relics,* April-May 1957, pp. 2, 3. Tales told by Jersey Dutch neighbors in the Pascack Valley when they come together "to smoke."

"Millburn Churches," by Lawrence H. Kellmer, Jr., in *Suburban Life,* July 1957, pp. 42, 43, 66.

"Miss Lucy Welsh's Home, Also Known as 'The Hatton House,'" in *Bulletin of the Gloucester County Historical Society,* June 1957, p. 29.

"New Jersey and the Great Pandemic," by Henry A. Davidson, M.D., in *Journal of the Medical Society of New Jersey,* August 1957, pp. 390-91. Influenza epidemic of 1918.

"New Jersey, the Garden State," by Mary Wendell Wagner, in *Daughters of the American Revolution Magazine,* June 1957, pp. 797, 807, 817.

"New Jersey Land Dispute" in *John Carter Brown Library Annual Report,* 1955-1956, pp. 30-34, 57-58. An account of 18th-century publications bearing on land disputes.

"New Jersey's Youngest County Is 100 Years Old This Month," by Nelson L. Carr, in *New Jersey County Government,* May 1957, p. 16.

"Old Barney 'Grand Old Champion of the Tides,'" in *New Jersey Outdoors,* July 1957 (inside cover). Hundredth anniversary of Barnegat Lighthouse 1957-58.

"Passaic County: 'National Manufactory' Born in Paterson," by D. Stanton Hammond, in *New Jersey County Government,* August 1957, pp. 2, 3, 10.

"The Schoolhouse in the Garden," by Margaret E. White, in *The Museum,* Spring 1957, pp. 14-16. Lyons Farms School House, now at Newark Museum.

"Slat Back Chairs," by John Cummings, in *Antiques Magazine,* July 1957, pp. 60-63. By curator, Bucks Co., Pa., Historical Society. Article includes Delaware Valley and New Jersey examples.

"Temple University Excavation at Buri, Burlington County, New Jersey," by Jacob W. Gruber and Ronald J. Mason, Temple University, in Archeological Society of New Jersey, *Bulletin* Number 12, November 1956, pp. 9-22.

THE NEW JERSEY HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Founded in 1845

THE OFFICERS

Dr. Richard P. McCormick, *President*
Rt. Rev. Benjamin M. Washburn, *First Vice-President*
Hon. John O. Bigelow, *Second Vice-President*
Frederick H. Groel, *Third Vice-President*
Mrs. Joseph W. Greene, *Corresponding Secretary*
Donald B. Kipp, *Recording Secretary*
Frederick Frelinghuysen, *Treasurer*

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Class of 1957

Hon. John O. Bigelow
Hiram E. Deats
Damon G. Douglas
Hon. Guy L. Fake
Edward J. Grassmann
John W. Griggs
Howard L. Hughes
William M. McBride
William L. Maude
Henry S. Puder
Mrs. W. Clark Symington

Class of 1958

Dominic A. Cavicchia
John T. Cunningham
Wilson C. Ely
Mrs. Frederick Frelinghuysen
Charles C. Gardner
William A. Hughes
Rt. Rev. Msgr. James F. Kelley
Richard V. Lindabury
Dr. Richard P. McCormick
Henry W. Pilch
Reeve Schley
Thomas T. Taber

Class of 1959

Charles B. Bradley
Lloyd M. Felmly
Frederick Frelinghuysen
Henry O. H. Frelinghuysen
Mrs. Joseph W. Greene
Frederick H. Groel
Donald B. Kipp
Hon. James F. Murray, Jr.
Donald A. Sinclair
Rt. Rev. Benjamin M. Washburn
Russell E. Watson

The above are listed as of January 1, 1957

THE NEW JERSEY HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Founded in 1845

STAFF

Robert M. Lunny, *Director*
Fred Shelley, *Librarian*
Howard W. Wiseman, *Assistant to the Director*
Mrs. Jasper S. Allard, Jr., *Secretary*
Addison Dennis, *Custodian*

TRUSTEES' COMMITTEES

Executive

Dr. Richard P. McCormick, *Chairman*
Hon. John O. Bigelow
Charles B. Bradley
Dominic A. Cavicchia
Frederick Frelinghuysen
Mrs. Frederick Frelinghuysen
Frederick H. Groel
Donald B. Kipp
Richard V. Lindabury
Donald A. Sinclair

Finance

Frederick H. Groel, *Chairman*
Charles B. Bradley
Frederick Frelinghuysen
William L. Maude
Henry S. Puder
Reeve Schley

Museum

Mrs. Frederick Frelinghuysen, *Chairman*
Mrs. Joseph S. Frelinghuysen
Mrs. Richard Hartshorne
Mrs. James C. Higgins
Mrs. W. Clark Symington
Thomas T. Taber
Rt. Rev. Benjamin M. Washburn

Library

Richard V. Lindabury, *Chairman*
Hon. John O. Bigelow
Charles C. Gardner
Edward J. Grassmann
Mrs. Joseph W. Greene
Howard L. Hughes
Henry W. Pilch
Donald A. Sinclair
Miss Miriam V. Studley

House

Dominic A. Cavicchia, *Chairman*
Wilson C. Ely
Hon. Guy L. Fake
Edward J. Grassmann
John W. Griggs

Editorial

Donald A. Sinclair, *Chairman*
Lloyd M. Felmly
Charles C. Gardner
Mrs. Joseph W. Greene
Hon. James F. Murray, Jr.

Membership

Hon. John O. Bigelow, *Chairman*
Damon G. Douglas
William A. Hughes
Rt. Rev. Msgr. James F. Kelley
William M. McBride
Russell E. Watson

The above are listed as of January 1, 1957

THE NEW JERSEY HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Founded in 1845

WOMAN'S BRANCH

Mrs. Frederick Frelinghuysen, *President*
Mrs. Richard Hartshorne, *First Vice-President*
Mrs. George W. Gedney, *Second Vice-President*
Mrs. S. Whitney Landon, *Third Vice-President*
Mrs. Carlton W. Tillinghast, *Recording Secretary*
Miss Helen Durand, *Corresponding Secretary*
Mrs. Hugh Pugh, *Treasurer*

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

The American Insurance Company
P. Ballantine & Sons
L. Bamberger & Company
Becton, Dickinson and Company
Bell Telephone Laboratories
Bremer Broadcasting Company, WAAT
Bristol-Myers Company
Continental Can Company
County Bank and Trust Company
Curtiss-Wright Corporation
Dollin Corporation
Damon G. Douglas Company
Driver-Harris Company
E. I. DuPont de Nemours Company
Esso Standard Oil Company
Federal Trust Company, Newark
Fidelity Union Trust Company
Firemen's Insurance Company
First National Bank & Trust Company of Paterson
Franklin Washington Trust Company
General Drafting Company
The Grand Union Company
Howard Savings Institution
Johnson & Johnson
Koos Brothers Furniture Company
Motor Finance Corporation
Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Company
National Biscuit Company
National Newark & Essex Banking Company
National State Bank
Newark News
Newark Public Library
New Jersey Bell Telephone Company
Prudential Insurance Company (Dryden Memorial Library)
Public Service Electric & Gas Company
Puder & Puder
Radio Corporation of America
Raybestos-Manhattan, Inc.
Reach, Yates & Mattoon, Inc.
Suburban Propane Gas Corporation
United Advertising Corporation
United States Metals Refining Company
Weston Electrical Instrument Corporation